The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. LXXXV NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, NOVEMBER 13, 1935 NUMBER 1093

Contents

The Week 1

Editorials

Dress Rehearsal for Neutrality 4
The Way In and the Way Out 5
Harvard Wakes Up 6

General Articles

Europe—Four Expectations ..... George Soule 7
Just Folks in Utopia ..... Harry Thornton Moore 9
Where Roosevelt Stands Today ..... Jonathan Mitchell 11
Working for the Government: II ..... Lindsay Rogers 14
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 16
Other People's Money ..... John T. Flynn 17
In a Dry Month ..... Otis Ferguson 18

Correspondence 19

Dead End ..... Stark Young 21

Books in Review

What Kind of Freedom? ..... Robert Morss Lovett 22
The Unbalancing of Powers ..... Hans Kohn 23
Small Talk on Large Forces ..... John Bakeless 23
Forward, March! ..... Norbert Guterman 24
Nemesis in the Cotton Belt ..... Hamilton Basso 24
Music Ho! ..... B. H. Haggin 25
A Social Process ..... Lewis Mumford 25
Fuss Over Mexico ..... Clyde O. Hunter 26
The Poet's Fancy ..... Cleanth Brooks, Jr. 27
Novels in Brief 27

The Week

FOLLOWING a poll of its fifty-odd members, the League of Nations this week set November 18 as the date to enforce against Italy financial and economic sanctions of the most sweeping character. The poll was remarkable for the speed with which replies were received at Geneva and their virtual unanimity of purpose. Under the terms as now formulated, Italy is cut off from arms and credits from member nations, can neither buy goods nor sell them, and at least forty-one nations have agreed to a mutual-assistance pact against her. The finality of these pronouncements brought out resentment in Italy, especially against England, and there were anti-British riots in Rome. Baron Pompeo Aloisi, Italy's representative at Geneva expressed annoyance at fruitless talks with Premier Laval of France and Britain's Foreign Minister, Sir Samuel Hoare. In Ethiopia, Mussolini's black-shirted legions, with native and colonial troops conveniently placed at the head of the columns, pushed forward on their slo[illegible]

BEHIND all this surface belligerence, however, there is reason to believe that Great Britain and Italy are much nearer a basis for agreement than either side is willing to admit. Mussolini feels that he has not yet made sufficient gains in Ethiopia to withdraw without loss of face. The Conservative government of Great Britain is in the midst of a general election campaign. Conservatives are posing as consecrated champions of the League and of human rights the world over. It would be inconvenient, to say the least, to give the appearance of too open horse trading before the elections are held. The effectiveness of the Conservative campaign was indicated by a number of municipal elections, held this week, in which the strong Conservative position was augmented by substantial gains, chiefly at the expense of the Labor Party. The Laborites, with the issue of sanctions and support of the League taken out of their hands by a clever political coup, are presenting a confused and not very effective opposition.

STATEMENTS from both President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull this week reaffirmed America's neutrality stand and the determination of the government to prevent, if possible, any attempt to make profits out of war trade. Germany still refrained from taking any active part in the present international situation, but showed signs of acute discomfort over the continued smoothness and effectiveness of Anglo-French coöperation. Officially inspired stories in Berlin newspapers showed no sense of irony whatever as they invoked the pale ghost of Locarno in protest—that same Locarno pact negotiated by the martyred Stresemann whom the Nazis reviled and whose name they erased from a street christened in his honor.

MOUNTING tension in the Orient exploded in pistol shots that critically wounded Premier Wang Ching-wei and four high officials of the Nanking government in China. Wang was regarded as leader of the pro-Japanese faction in the government. Earlier in the week Japan had presented three demands on China: that all anti-Japanese movements be eradicated; that North China engage in economic coöperation with Manchukuo; that China accept Japanese military assistance if necessary [illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Manchukuo. Leaders of the Chinese Nationalist Party met with Generalissimo Chiang Kai-shek at Nanking to formulate a reply to Japan. As they filed out into a courtyard to have their photograph taken, a Chinese reporter stepped forward and loosed the volley that brought down Premier Wang and four of his companions. This was taken as a symptom of growing discontent in China with what is regarded as the pro-Japanese policy of the Kuomintang. So far, no immediate crisis seems to have followed this incident, but the possibilities of a major outbreak in the Orient are considerable.

IN HER domestic affairs, the United States prepared somewhat listlessly for some scattered, off-year elections. A governorship in Kentucky, a mayoralty in Philadelphia, a new Assembly in New York State, were some of the points at issue, and the chief interest in the elections lay in what clue, if any, they might give to any significant growth or shrinkage in the popularity of the national administration. Mr. Roosevelt himself took the matter very calmly, going up to Hyde Park to vote and incidentally to spend a quiet week-end in the country as he awaited election day. On Thursday night he was awakened by a slight earthquake shock, a rare occurrence on the Atlantic seaboard, along which it was perceptible from New York to Quebec and felt at its greatest intensity, apparently, in Brooklyn. Little real damage was reported even there. Scientists agreed that this shock had no connection with a severe earthquake felt this week in Helena, Montana, already plagued with recurring shocks that have taken a heavy toll of life and property.

THE genie of federal relief, which Mr. Roosevelt has released from the bottle of local and state public welfare, refuses to return to its original container. It is not to be expected that administration authorities having come to depend in large measure on federal aid, will with alacrity assume a burden in some cases quite out of proportion to their resources. In Georgia a test survey of 110 cases closed from the rolls in May showed that not one had been taken care of by other agencies. Among those on federal relief rolls are 7,400,000 children under sixteen. Particularly unfortunate is the abandonment of relief to transients, which in some places took effect on November 1.

IN DIVESTING the federal government of the responsibility for direct relief, Mr. Roosevelt confronts what may prove to be the most difficult year of his administration. With the election approaching, he is naturally anxious to save money, to hand back to Congress a substantial part of the $4,800,000,000 allotted him, and to allocate as much as possible of the remainder to public work. The work program is lagging. Instead of 3,500,000 to work relief. That they are not satisfied is shown by constant disputes in regard to wages and hours. The complete shutting down of federal relief on December 1, as now indicated, seems utterly out of the question. Seven states are already off the roll, however, and others will be removed as rapidly as possible. Those on relief and the relief workers who serve them are now to some extent organized and form a distinct class in the community, with votes and influence. Will their immediate experience of dislocation of means of support and actual suffering dull their feeling of gratitude? Will they turn to bite the hand that hitherto has fed them? It is thought by some that the four billion dollars denounced by the Republicans as a great campaign fund, may turn out to be a campaign liability instead of an asset.

ONE of the early guns of the 1936 campaign was fired last week. Federal Relief Administrator Hopkins sharply attacked Governor Alf Landon of Kansas on the ground that that state had not contributed "one thin dime" toward relief. Promptly friends of Governor Landon rallied to reply. They pointed out that in Kansas the counties and cities pay for relief which in many other commonwealths comes from state funds. Of the total expenditure for relief and work relief, these sources have provided in Kansas about 26 percent, which is approximately the national average and is better than some thirty other states have done. Kansas is chiefly an agricultural state; most of its problem has to do with farmers, and has been met by the A.A.A. This probably explains the Kansans' boast that federal funds have been used almost entirely for work relief and for transients.

WHAT Governor Landon's friends do not say is that he and the political leaders behind him are responsible for continuing this policy of putting the relief burden on the counties and cities, a policy that is thoroughly bad. The state has important sources of revenue that are not open to the lesser political subdivisions, notably the income tax. The counties and cities have had to meet their burden out of local resources, as best they could. One thing they have done is almost to suspend work on the roads, many of which are today in shockingly bad condition. Another expedient has been to cut the salaries of local employees, and especially the teachers. Governor Landon is a monomaniac on the subject of a balanced budget—a political monomaniac, no doubt. The state is paying dearly for his fetish.

THE new 1936 automobiles are now being advertised with the customary explosion of superlatives. Each is the biggest, best and cheapest ever. Each is simply littered with breath-taking new inventions, although the automotive engineers, in their cold reports to their own fraternity, state that there is little change from the cars of 1935. The same new

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

cars of that number of companies, and is to be identified only by physical inspection or by shrewd detective work plus some guessing. Meanwhile, the average American continues to drive, not so much an automobile as a glittering, resplendent idea skillfully created for him by the advertising writer's art.

THE country is at last thoroughly alarmed by the rising tide of deaths in automobile accidents. It is not yet prepared to prevent this huge mortality by physical limitation on motor-car speed, or effective intelligence tests for drivers, but it is developing some ingenious halfway measures. Thus one Midwestern judge is sentencing to prison, not the reckless driver but his car, which is impounded in a police garage for thirty, sixty or ninety days. Such action probably bites deeper, for many people, than a fine. Another judge takes off the license plates and keeps them for a period of time appropriate to the offense. Still another is especially hard on those—they are said to be largely college boys—who drive prehistoric rattletraps which endanger human life by threatening to fall apart in traffic. In such cases the owner's fine is the sum he paid for his car; if he cannot pay, as is often the case, his vehicle is taken from him and broken up by police hammers. While occasionally such a plan may work great hardship, on the whole it substantially reduces the dangers of life on the open road.

APPEARANCE this week of the first issue of The Consumers' Defender in its new form as a monthly magazine devoted to consumer interests gives evidence of the growing strength and popularity of the consumers'-coöperative movement in America. The magazine is published by Coöperative Distributors, Inc., of 30 Irving Place, New York City, and is an outgrowth of what began as little more than a monthly catalogue, or technical section, with occasional general articles inserted at the front. Coöperative Distributors, Inc., not only analyzes and tests a wide range of consumers' goods, but actually markets to its members at substantial savings in cost a large number of products that meet its exacting standards. Many of them are fabricated in its own laboratories. The organization is affiliated with the Coöperative League of the United States. Under the editorship of James Rorty, The Consumers' Defender in its new form will continue to uphold the principle of collective bargaining both for labor and consumers and will carry articles and news of general interest to the coöperative movement.

DAVID LAMSON, former sales manager of the Stanford University Press, is being placed on trial for the third time for the murder of his wife. The first trial resulted in conviction, but the verdict was unanimously reversed by the Supreme Court of California, which ordered a second trial, at which the jury was unable to agree. The prosecution contends that Lamson, angered by his wife's nagging, struck her with a pipe or other heavy object and killed her. The defense contends that death was accidental; that Mrs. Lamson, standing in the bathtub, fell and struck her head with lethal force against the side of the tub. At both trials the weight of expert medical and chemical testimony was definitely on the side of the defense. That such falls occur and are frequently fatal is certain: two women died of bathtub falls between the first and second trials. The San Francisco coroner recorded in 1933-34 more than sixty deaths due to skull fractures received from falls from standing height. The most deplorable thing about the whole case has been the way in which the fate of a sentient human being has been made a mere football in the efforts of newspapers to sensationalize the case and thus increase their sales, and the machinations of local officials seeking to gain notoriety and political advantage from being connected with the case. It is to be hoped that the state of California, the local officials and the Stanford University community will accord this third trial of David Lamson a measure of decency, along with at least some attempt to administer justice.

GERMANY'S protest against a magazine article by Winston Churchill, in which he gravely speculated on whether or not Hitler was a "monster," may easily conceal important diplomatic maneuvers. Since last August, when it became apparent that Laval was strongly on the side of Mussolini in the Ethiopian crisis, Germany has been making great efforts to reach a permanent understanding with England. As a good-will offering, Hitler is supposed to have promised not to take advantage of the Ethiopian situation to stir up conflict in Austria. Although these reports are without confirmation, he is also supposed to have pledged himself not to defeat the League's sanctions by selling war materials to Italy.

OTHER reports from the recent meeting of the Bank of International Settlements at Basel leave no doubt that the price Hitler asks in return is England's assistance—or at least her benevolent neutrality—in a future war of Germany and Poland against Soviet Russia. Within the last few days, he has apparently made similar proposals to France, and it is known that Ferand de Brinon, close personal adviser of Laval, has had extended interviews with Hitler. It is evident that these developments have greatly worried the Russian leaders. Winston Churchill, although he has little love for Russia, represents a faction in the British Tory group that regards a rearmed Germany as the chief peril to the peace of Europe and a nation with whom any agreement would be highly dangerous. By challenging his magazine article, Germany evidently hopes to discover whether the Churchill influence will be dominant in the next Tory government, or whether it can hope for British sympathy in

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dress Rehearsal for Neutrality

IN SEPARATE statements last week, President Roosevelt and Secretary of State Hull declared that they disapproved of all trade tending to prolong the Italo-Ethiopian war. Mr. Roosevelt also announced that more than a month ago, at Hyde Park, he had encouraged George F. Johnson, of the Endicott-Johnson Company, to reject an order of shoes for the Italian army. It was unofficially hinted that the administration would like to place an embargo on exports of all war materials to the belligerents. It was deterred from doing so, according to this report, only by fears that the ambiguities of the present temporary neutrality act would cause such an order to be upset in the courts.

There would seem to be no immediate danger that this country will be dragged into the Italo-Ethiopian conflict, whatever policy the administration pursues. What we are now witnessing is a dress rehearsal in neutral conduct. Before the end of next February, the country must decide on a permanent neutrality policy to take the place of the existing temporary act. The character of this legislation will affect the whole field of our relations with other countries, and may decide whether we are to be involved in another world struggle.

Because of the accidental fact that our trade with Ethiopia is negligible, the administration has succeeded in satisfying both those who believe that we should support collective action for peace, and those who want us to stand aside from all foreign quarrels. Technically, Mr. Roosevelt's and Mr. Hull's efforts to discourage trade in war materials apply to both belligerents. In practice, they amount to sanctions against Italy alone, and the administration has been able to give the appearance of supporting—at least *morally*—the assembled nations at Geneva.

When permanent legislation is enacted at the next session of Congress, however, a decision between these two groups will have to be taken. No law can be written that will enable us both to intervene against an aggressor nation and at the same time to preserve rigid neutrality. The dangerous thing about the Ethiopian crisis has been the aid that it has given the advocates of collective action in putting their case in a superficially appealing light. At a moment when fifty-odd countries are united at Geneva in an effort to end the massacre of defenseless tribesmen in the Ethiopian highlands, many Americans undoubtedly have an instinctive feeling that we ought to lend a hand.

Behind the argument of most advocates of collective action there is something resembling the parable of the Good Samaritan. Consciously or unconsciously, they seek to put those who believe in strict neutrality in the position of urging that the United States play the part of the Pharisee who [illegible] and passed by. For centuries

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

If it were true that Ethiopia was a single, mistreated individual, and the United States a fellow journeyer on the same road, our moral duty—together with our self-interest in promoting safety in travel—would be evident. We ought to join in defending Ethiopia from the Italian brigands.

The question that advocates of collective action need to answer, however, is whether the parable of the Good Samaritan has any relation to modern international power politics. Eighteen years ago, you will recall, the democracies of Europe—which by mischance included the tsardom of Russia and the kingdoms of Belgium, Italy, Serbia, Montenegro and Greece—were attacked by the German autocracy, and we were told that it was our duty to rescue them. When the time came to make peace, however, Mr. Wilson found it difficult to give substance to the ideals that supposedly had caused our entrance into the War. Clemenceau, who did not believe in parables, told Mr. Wilson that the United States was four thousand miles away, that the responsibility of keeping peace in Europe would rest upon European countries, and that, therefore, America was not entitled to dictate its terms. Only by agreeing to a military alliance among the United States, France and England was Mr. Wilson able to persuade Clemenceau not to occupy the Rhineland and to join the League of Nations. When the Senate refused to ratify the three-power alliance, along with the Treaty of Versailles, our influence in Europe sank almost to zero. Most Americans now feel that the moral principles for which we ostensibly entered the War were thoroughly betrayed.

Let us suppose that Mr. Roosevelt, in the present Ethiopian crisis, were able to act as former Secretary of State Stimson, and other advocates of collective action, would like to have him act. Suppose he were able to move step by step with the League, and impose financial and economic sanctions upon Italy alone. Suppose, furthermore, that when Mussolini surrendered under the weight of the League's and America's sanctions, the United States were invited to participate in the subsequent peace negotiations.

The terms that would be imposed on Italy are presumably those contained in the report, two months ago, of the League's Committee of Five. They provided for the appointment of foreign advisers to Haile Selassie and the granting of large concessions. To many observers, they appeared to provide for a veiled mandate over Ethiopia, for the benefit chiefly of Italy and England. Although Haile Selassie accepted the Committee of Five's report, there is good reason to believe that he did so only to save his empire from conquest by Italy. The question that advocates of collective action must answer is whether, at a future peace conference, American representatives would be listened to if they objected to such terms. Would they not be told, as Mr. Wilson was told by Clemenceau—

rance and Italy must settle their clashing ambi-ons as seems best to them? In such a case, it is ife to predict that many Americans would wonder hether we had been supporting the Good Samari-n or the brigands. Justifiably, they would also onder whether we had not largely failed in re-ucing the danger of a future general European ar.

The width of the Atlantic Ocean is a fact that lvocates of collective action seem constantly to nore. As far as Europe is concerned, it is not ue that this country has a choice between support-g, or refusing to support, efforts for collective eace. In practice, the only choice ever open to us to support, or refuse to support, one group of uropean nations against another group. Except or Soviet Russia, there is no great European power at is not pursuing policies leading to war, or that uld be counted upon to make a wise and enduring eace. We have not the power to bring about the onomic and political reorganization of Europe, en if we had the will to do so. By adopting strict eutrality as its permanent policy next February, is country will thereby pledge itself to do nothing hinder Europe in settling its own conflicts. At e present time, that is the chief service we can erform for peace.

The Way In and the Way Out

WITH ALL the various types of national planning that have lately been under consid-ration in Washington, practically no attention has een given to the highly important question of planned population utilization"—of determining what age the young ought to enter industry and ne old to leave it, with all the corollary questions involved. This matter recently has been considered, its relation to Great Britain, by P.E.P. (Political nd Economic Planning), the group of British busi-ess men, public officials and economic experts asso-ated for the study of the major questions of the ay. Their reports, "The Entrance to Industry" nd "The Exit from Industry," offer much that is f interest and importance to the United States.

Laissez-faire and rugged individualism have ever in any country provided for the care of the oung and the old. It has been necessary to assume hat the family or the state would do this. The amily having become less adequate to a task that as grown in magnitude and complication, the state as progressively increased its share of the burden ven while the merits of individualism were still eing trumpeted. P.E.P., looking upon the English cene, finds the care for the young not only inade-uate but poorly coördinated and lacking direction. The British school system has provided education, edical supervision, recreation and some food, up o the age of fourteen. But during the period from ourteen to eighteen, when youth is emerging from [illegible] "social provision falters." Social services are intermittent or absent. Although during these years the personnel of industry is being initiated and trained, "the entrance into industry is still an unorganized scramble." In the future these years will be even more important than in the past. The population will shrink and become older in composition and, therefore, more conservative at a time when the need for adaptation to changing economic conditions is likely to be greater than ever. "The only hope of raising, or even maintaining, the quality of our civilization depends upon the training which we provide for our young citizens in their formative years."

P.E.P., therefore, calls for a comprehensive "fourteen-to-eighteen" policy, aimed at extending the educational influence over these years, ensuring effective health supervision and introducing an organized system of industrial recruiting, training and supervision. Full-time education should be restricted to those likely to benefit from it, but all should be compelled to remain in school until the age of fifteen. Between the ages of fifteen and eighteen all boys and girls should be permitted to engage in half-time work, provided they attend a continuation school for half time. These schools would be oriented to the need for adaptability in the coming years, and would attempt to compensate for the growing monotony of industrial work by inculcating a sense of coöperation in productive activity. Reorganized technical training should take the place of the rapidly dying apprenticeship system, to the mutual benefit of young workers and employers. Coöperation with employers should provide an opportunity for improving techniques of vocational guidance. The continuation school could serve as a social "base" to which the young worker could return for advice and help. Provision should be made for cultural activities and physical training. Meals should be provided where needed. Until the basic problem of social assistance and the standard of living shall have been more satisfactorily solved, temporary money grants should be made to prevent the denial of work opportunities to young people from further reducing the standard of living of poor families. These reforms would not only reduce the intolerable waste of life during vitally formative years but would also somewhat remedy the "maldistribution of work and leisure which sets immature boys and girls to work while men and women in the prime of life are condemned to idleness"; it is estimated that by 1940 half a million additional work opportunities would have been created for adults.

P.E.P. concludes that as most of the aged are fit only for light work, and there are large numbers of able-bodied persons who find difficulty in obtaining work, the aged should be given retirement allowances and provided with leisure-time activities. Though conditions of cost preclude allowances be-[illegible] more than five persons [illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

needs; the present schemes should be amended to provide pensions of twenty shillings a week for men and fifteen shillings for women. Individual saving, industrial-pension funds and others organized co-operatively by workers and employers should be encouraged, but only to provide a comfortable income above the minimum. The cost of state pensions would be reduced by the likelihood that some three hundred thousand persons would probably retire and make room in industry for at least one hundred thousand persons at present receiving unemployment benefits. The remaining burden should be distributed equally between workers, employers and the state until the method of financing the pension services generally can be overhauled. The provision of leisure-time activities for the aged should be subjected to "careful study."

While these plans are especially directed towards British conditions, they deal with dangerous problems inevitably thrown up in the wake of developing capitalism. The part played by the dissatisfied youth of Germany in the rise of the National Socialist government and the student revolts in other countries show how easily youth abandons respect for traditional institutions when these fail to promise satisfaction to the emerging adult. Reports such as these by P.E.P., carefully reasoned, statistically supported and springing from an organic view of society, are of great value if social change is to follow an orderly path to political stability.

Harvard Wakes Up

A CORRESPONDENT at Harvard University sends us some news items that are symptomatic of the general awakening to political and economic realities now taking place in American colleges. Apparently the news from Cambridge doesn't consist entirely of further instalments of that semi-perpetual serial, The Roosevelt Boys and Their High-Powered Automobiles.

Quite a stir was created when Professor Kirtley F. Mather, of Harvard's Geology department, refused to take the teachers' loyalty oath required by a Massachusetts state law which went into effect last month. President Conant issued a statement to the effect that while he considered the passage of the bill "unfortunate," he regarded the possibility of a legal controversy over enforcement of the law, in which Harvard might be involved, as still more unfortunate. It is possible that behind President Conant's too-careful statement lay the University's fear of state taxation on its millions of dollars of tax-free holdings. In any event, Professor Mather retracted his stand by saying that his personal position was not important enough to involve the University in a legal battle.

The withdrawal of Professor Mather, however, did not stop his troops. Considerable support had [illegible] and [illegible] fight for the repeal of the teachers' oath bill. O was the student-faculty committee, composed members of all the colleges in the Greater Bost area. The second was the committee of one hu dred Harvard students, led by the heads of Tl Crimson, the Student Council, the Liberal Club, tl National Students' League and the Students' Leag for Industrial Democracy. These committees a now working on plans for circulating petitions f the repeal of the teachers' oath bill throughout tl state. There is also a plan afoot for the formati of a faculty committee at Harvard to work for t defeat at the polls of legislators who voted for t bill.

Meanwhile, there has now been established Harvard the Cambridge Union of Universi Teachers, which has applied for an A.F. of charter as a local chapter of the American Feder tion of Teachers. The Union now has forty me bers, led by Dr. J. Raymond Walsh, instructor Economics, and including on its executive boa F. O. Matthiessen, History and Literature; A. Coolidge, Chemistry; Lincoln Fairley, Economi (M.I.T.); Max Lerner, Government; K. F. M ther, Geology; D. W. Prall, Philosophy; and Al Sweezey, Economics. In a printed statement their purposes, the members of the Union laid e phasis on the fact that they were not going to u "weapons" such as strikes and other tactics of i dustrial warfare, but would rely on "good will" their fight against restrictions of academic freedo and against "discrimination on grounds of race of social, religious, economic, political opinions activities."

As might have been expected, these various a tivities aroused Mr. Hearst to a jingoistic field da The news items that are recorded here we proclaimed in The Boston American as evidenc of "dangerous radical activity at Harvard," ar that newspaper was particularly violent in its a tacks on faculty members who had written artic for liberal magazines. There are signs, howeve that Harvard's tradition of intellectual indepen ence will be maintained, in spite of Mr. Hears

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1935, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 40 EAST 49TH STREET, NEW YORK CITY. BRUCE BLIVEN, PRESIDENT, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER.

EDITORS

BRUCE BLIVEN MALCOLM COWLEY R. M. LOVETT
GEORGE SOULE STARK YOUNG

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

HAMILTON BASSO H. N. BRAILSFORD JOHN DEWEY
JOHN T. FLYNN WALDO FRANK E. C. LINDEMAN
W. P. MANGOLD R. G. TUGWELL LEWIS MUMFORD
JONATHAN MITCHELL

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRIPTION, FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Europe—Four Expectations

WHILE the Italo-Ethiopian-League crisis has been developing I have been in the U.S.S.R., Austria, Switzerland, France and England. I have talked with Foreign Office men and diplomats, with military officers, journalists, politicians of the left and center, with workers and doctors and peasants. I have read newspapers and have been to the theatres. On the trains I have conversed not only with citizens of the nations in which I have stayed, but with Czechoslovakian, Italian, Pole and Rumanian. Almost everybody believes that some kind of turning point has been reached in the affairs of Europe. Nobody is certain—the best informed least of all—in which direction the turning will lead. Everyone is puzzled and everyone is alarmed. But the most reasonable analyses of the situation may be rather simply classified, on the scale of optimism and pessimism. The reader is at liberty to take his choice.

Pessimism—Black

This view expects a general European war to develop out of the action of Mussolini, perhaps within six weeks. It admits that none of the peoples and none of the responsible statesmen of the major powers wants war now—not even Hitler. But it argues that once events of this magnitude have begun to flow in a given direction they become uncontrollable.

The League attempts economic sanctions. These will work slowly and uncertainly because of the reluctance of certain nations to coöperate. They will not stop Mussolini, but only stir him to further desperation. The prestige of the League is sharply challenged. Having undertaken to discipline an aggressor, it must make its action effective. Jealousy will arise of the profits made by the nations that openly or covertly evade embargoes. The next stop is a naval and military blockade. Mussolini will try to break it with force. Military sanctions almost inevitably follow economic, and war follows military sanctions.

Once warfare begins, the developments are incalculable. Greece and Turkey are both eager to take a whack at Italy. It is reported that the greatest danger of an open breach of European peace in the past weeks has arisen from them. The Western powers have with difficulty restrained them. The restoration of the monarchy in Greece means the final ousting of the pro-Italian Venizelist influence, and preparation for war. A Turkish official has been quoted as saying privately, "I want a hundred years of peace, but before it becomes one—e-

The Hungarian ruling class lives only for the day when it can regain lost territory. It lays all its plans in view, not of peace and reconciliation, but of future war. It revolves in the German orbit, and refuses to apply sanctions against Italy. Disturbances in the Near East will tempt it to strike. The Austrian government is utterly dependent on Mussolini. If it is weakened substantially, either by Italy's troubles or by its difficulties with the League, the chance of the Austrian Nazis arrives. That pulls in Germany. Neither France nor Britain will consent to Nazi absorption of Austria. Hitler's economic situation daily becomes worse. From the military and diplomatic point of view he would prefer to wait a year or two for the conflict, but if the crisis is forced upon him by events, he may conclude that the day is now or never. Poland, like Hungary, is virtually an ally of Germany, and is hostile to League sanctions. With Hungary, Austria and Germany engaged, she would of course follow with an attack on Czechoslovakia, part of which she hopes to divide with Hungary. Rumania and the Soviet Union would necessarily be involved on the other side. Even though France, England and Jugoslavia are against the new bloc of Central Powers, the calculations of military men indicate that in divisions and war resources the league of the unsatisfied would be formidable. Particularly so since Japan is expected to engage the Soviet Union in the East.

War necessarily means the dominance of reaction in the internal politics of every country, at least temporarily. In France the danger of fascism would increase, and in England the Conservatives would consolidate their expected victory in the forthcoming elections. In the Soviet Union no political change would occur, but socialist construction would be sadly hampered and the most promising experiment of our times would be set back, perhaps irretrievably. If the European peoples did not destroy themselves, there could be discerned the faint glimmer of a revolutionary dawn, but the sun might rise on a world of corpses.

Pessimism—Gray

Black pessimism is the view only of a small number of journalists and independent observers; gray pessimism may be called the orthodox opinion among the professional diplomatists and military experts. They incline to the belief that whatever happens between Italy and the League, that conflict will be localized, for the simple reason that Ger-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

not be prepared for a year and a half. From both diplomatic and military points of view, Germany has everything to gain from the present crisis if she waits and plays her cards well.

If Mussolini is sufficiently weakened by an exhausting war or by sanctions, Austria will fall into Germany's lap, and the weakening process will take time. Meanwhile political penetration of the Baltic states will continue, and preparations in Poland and Hungary can be perfected. In the end, Italy will either be a German ally, or will be an inconsiderable enemy. France is divided and irresolute; if Germany remains passive, the division between France and Britain in attitude toward Italy is likely to continue. Germany will angle for British favor on this score. She may succeed in obtaining eventual British neutrality if she does not move now. For this prize she would gladly sacrifice Italy.

When military preparations are completed, when the entente among Italy, France and England is effectually broken, and when the first, or perhaps even the first two, of these nations are rendered incapable of effective action by internal difficulties, Germany will strike. War is confidently expected within two years. There is no longer any doubt of the German line-up with Poland and Hungary. The division of spoils is already completed, on paper. Germany will get Danzig and the Corridor, so that she can expand eastward along the Baltic through Lithuania, Latvia and Esthonia. Poland will be compensated by part of the Slovakian slice of Czechoslovakia, and by an outlet on the Black Sea through Rumania and a strip of the Ukraine, including Odessa. Hungary will gobble the rest of the Slovak country and of course will also encroach, with Austria, on her other neighbors. These plans are well known in every capital. Meanwhile Japan will of course attack in Siberia and will try to extend her lines as far west as Lake Baikal.

So far this pessimism looks almost as black as the first variety. It is relieved, however, by the prospect of delay. Something may turn up in the meantime. And even if war comes, the Soviet Union, for instance, will have gained in preparation as well as Germany. Japan is likely to have overextended her powers. If the Germanic allies, with their admitted military prowess and excellent organization, cannot win a smashing victory within two months, internal weaknesses are bound to develop. A revolutionary dawn among the aggressors is, in this case, expected not only by those on the left but by serious statesmen on the right, and it might come soon enough to forestall the devastation of a long war.

Optimism

A surprising but not unreasonable optimism can be found among a minority of the best informed. [illegible] sound to the skep- within the next twelve months, and the reorientation of Europe toward peaceful coöperation, without either war or proletarian revolution.

In Italy, this will be the end of Mussolini. Contrary to the advice of King, General Staff and high officials of the Fascist Party, he has staked everything on this desperate gamble. He is, in literal truth, mad, as a psychological analysis of his life will demonstrate, and his madness will soon develop to a point where it cannot be concealed. He cannot win a quick conquest of Ethiopia, and the spirits of his cohorts will be dampened by delay, difficulty and disease. At home there is already a great unexpressed and unorganized aversion to his course, which will be rapidly strengthened by the opposition of most of the rest of the world. Sanctions will ruin Italian business and make the conditions of life, already bad, completely intolerable. France will coöperate with Britain in effective sanctions, not only because the majority of the people in the left parties support that course, but because the army and the statesmen would never choose Italy as an ally at the cost of British friendship. Germany will not give Italy much help, first, because she herself has a scarcity of raw materials; second, because she will not offend Britain.

With Mussolini's fall, the prestige of fascism everywhere will be weakened. The existing Austrian dictatorship will as a matter of course follow him into the grave. In that event it is by no means certain that the Nazis will succeed it. The suppressed left is not destroyed; it has flourished underground. And the Catholic Christian Social Party is likely to coöperate with it rather than see the Nazis come in.

Most surprising of all, there is a belief in the probability of the fall of Hitler during the coming winter. His own party troops have been effectually blanketed by the Reichswehr, which has in its hands the dominant power in the nation. The Reichswehr has supported Hitler, in spite of dislike and distrust of him, because he has made it possible for Germany to rearm. But the time has come when Hitler cannot serve the Reichswehr any more. On the contrary, he is now a liability. Rearmament has eaten up all Germany's liquid capital. It is difficult to obtain necessary materials from abroad. On account of his suppression of the Jews and the fears he has aroused, it is impossible for Hitler to get credit from England, France or the United States, and without foreign credit, Germany's economic life stagnates and rearmament slows down. If popular discontent rises sufficiently this winter, the Reichswehr will either overthrow Hitler or permit him to be overthrown. Food is scarce; butter and meat are in many places almost impossible to obtain. Rumblings are heard from workers' districts.

The new government, supported by the Reichswehr in the background, will not be military in form. It will be democratic, parliamentary, with sane ele-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

British and possibly by American credit. The Reichswehr may constitute an ultimate war danger, it is admitted, but the new government will be maintained by foreign finance as the only alternative to something "worse than Hitler." And the Reichswehr pretends that its foreign policy differs essentially from Hitler's. It wants, not European territory but colonies, and it wants, not political but economic hegemony of Central Europe. For this purpose it must get agreements lowering tariffs and other trade restrictions. And in order to obtain cooperation on such a program, it is necessary to squelch absolutely the fear—or the hope—of war. Economic nationalism thrives either on the fear of blockades or on the expectation of territorial enlargement. Therefore Germany under the new government will make a point of allaying uncertainty and coöperating with Europe.

In an atmosphere of peace and prosperity, the U.S.S.R. can continue her development, and the left forces in France and Italy can go on to build their strength by democratic means. Violent revolution, stimulated by danger of violent coups from the extreme right, will recede into the background.

The Middle Ground

Finally, there are a few observers who flatter themselves that they exercise a liberal objectivity, distrusting logically perfect conclusions, who expect none of these decisive results, but a continuation of the present confusion and muddle. The nations will not enforce effective sanctions. The League will take only sufficient action to preserve a badly damaged prestige. After enough victories to satisfy the demand for glory, Italy will agree to a partition of Ethiopia, to which France and Britain will gladly consent. The French Fascists will not gain power, but a sort of economic fascism will be established under a nominally democratic government, with the support of the Right and Center. If the People's Front wins a majority in the elections to the Chamber next spring, it will soon be split by internal disagreements. In England the general election will result in a gain for the Labor Party, but not a majority, and that party will continue to be reformist and ineffectual. War may come out of the tangle in Germany and Central Europe, but nobody knows when; and on the other hand, it may not come. Hitler, through sheer inertia, will continue to rule. The peoples will drag along, perhaps being relieved from the worst of the depression by a business revival, but without being able to achieve stable prosperity. The resolution and the hopes of all extremists will wear themselves out against the stubborn contrariness of human nature.

Perhaps this should be called, not a middle ground, but the most pessimistic view of all.

Surveying the possibilities, one shares the universal anger at the Italian dictator, expressed by a Swiss printer, who said to me, *"Mussolini ist ein böser Mensch." Bös*—meaning both "cross" and "bad"—is more to the point than any single English word. I do not know who is right about the future. But one thing is certain—in every European country the masses of the people hate war and oppression; they love friendliness and sanity. Somehow or other they will eventually get their way.

George Soule.

Just Folks in Utopia

A GRAY-HAIRED man, surprisingly little, with horn-rimmed glasses and a gumdrop moustache, opens the first national convention of Townsend Clubs, which are named after him. He raps with his gavel, and as the tumult of applause fades, his lean brown face shows how deeply he is stirred. He speaks in a clear, unwavering voice that is strangely calm in contrast to the extravagant things he is saying. The atmosphere is one to encourage superlatives: the Stevens Hotel calls itself the largest in the world, and Dr. Townsend says that in a city noted for its bigness "this is the biggest political convention ever held." The imitation-Versailles ballroom is hung with blue and gold banners proclaiming: The Three Emancipators—Washington, Lincoln, Townsend; and, First We Laughed Then—Enlisted; and, Enact the Townsend Plan in This Congress or Elect Townsend Men for the [illegible] which is to instruct Townsend Club members how to go to work on the House of Representatives.

The delegates—6,993 of them will register before the convention closes—have come from every state and even from Alaska. Most of them are beyond sixty; middle age is widely represented also and there is a sprinkling of youth. The delegates in general are "just folks," Methodist-picnic people. They are for the most part the fathers and mothers of the Lost Generation; they have seen their children in the despair of unemployment or rushing frenziedly from Left Bank to left wing; they have had their own faith in Harding, Coolidge and Hoover blasted, and are afraid to put their trust in Roosevelt. So at last they are pathetically willing to try a mildly revolutionary movement instigated by one of themselves, a kindly old doctor who takes his bedside manner to the econ[illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the Stevens. The Californians are by far the great majority, and dominate the voting and appointment of committees. One of the California delegates is wearing a frock coat and stove-pipe hat, and has chin-whiskers like Lincoln's; but he is a red-faced man with a greeter's manner. There are several Negro delegates; one of them tells the crowd of the "enthusiASM" his race feels for the Plan, and the other delegates tenderly sing "Old Black Joe." A representatives of the Townsend youth group bitterly attacks the C.C.C. He grows hysterical as he tells of visiting his "pal" at one of the camps and finding him "tight" after a visit to a "sporting house." The leaders of the movement do little to check the wild statements; their own superlatives mount—"Dr. Townsend is leading a greater army than has ever been known in history." The little physician is hardly less modest when in his official address to the convention he says that the two-percent processing tax "will carry off the pensions and in a few years pay off the national debt!" He gives broad hints that the organization will not stop after the pensions bill is passed; it will go on to greater reforms. Storms of applause, and singing of "Onward Townsend Soldiers, Marching on to War." Robert E. Clements, co-founder and national secretary, describes the clubs as a militant organization and not a debating society. Clements is a former California real-estate speculator, a sallow blond fortyish man with something of a lean and hungry look; he is the true promoter of the movement. He protests so violently against the charges of dishonesty that have been leveled at him that the convention gives him a unanimous vote of confidence. Reassured, he cries out: "If the reporters report all right what happened here, every politician will know what side his bread is buttered on . . . our bill must pass next session or else——"

The delegates sit taking all this in; they are spry, excited old people, friendly and happy and earnest. Some of the men wear old-fashioned high collars, some wear blue shirts, and a few of them hold ten-gallon hats in their laps. Many of them, in addition to their blue-ribboned delegates' badges, have red-ribboned badges that attest their membership in the "Legion," a mythical "higher degree" that costs one dollar. Two sixty-five-year-old women are introduced from the platform because they have hitch-hiked from California. None of the delegates seems to tire: for them the old American dream of security and plenty is about to be realized.

Yet there are some who have not trusted Dr. Townsend and co-founder Clements. Former leaders have made serious charges against them, accusing them of misappropriating funds and of running the whole project for their personal benefit. Six of these men have been invited to present their charges to the convention, and the night they are to appear is exciting. The chairman pleads with the delegates not to manhandle the rebels. He then introduces the [illegible] than the head of the business committee, Sheridan Downey, who after running for Lieutenant Governor on Upton Sinclair's Epic ticket, turned to the more successful O.A.R.P. (Old Age Revolving Pensions), which has the sanction of Governor Merriam. When Downey calls for the six rebel leaders and none of them shows up, he waxes bitter against them, calling them cowardly Judases.

Gomer Smith, a famous lawyer of Indian blood from Oklahoma, keeps the delegates in good humor with his racy, biblical speech. His rolling gait, his drawl and his physical appearance are peculiarly reminiscent of Huey Long. When he denounces Roosevelt, whom as a delegate in 1932 he helped nominate, the crowd in a body rises to cheer. He compares the present system to a crap game, "—and we're gonna make the rules now ourselves for a while." Congressman Morris of Pennsylvania, who says he represents the district containing Mellon's wealth, comes next, and when he says "I've just heard another Huey Long—so have you," there is one of the greatest demonstrations of the convention. Ironically, it is just at this time that a mysterious blinking figure without a delegate's badge is observed on the platform sitting behind the chairman, whispering to him and Townsend and Clements, and keeping out of range of cameras. When asked who this is, Townsend leaders say they do not remember his name; he is just an advisory "parliamentarian." It is actually Earl J. Christenberry, secretary of the late Huey Long.

The convention ends with a great rally at the International Amphitheatre. The meeting begins with someone's reading of a long address prepared by A. F. Whitney, president of the Brotherhood of Railway Trainmen. The speeches of Townsend and Clements are broadcast nationally by N.B.C.: a crowd estimated at nine thousand fills most of the great stone-and-steel auditorium. A Townsend official in the press-box whispers that Louisiana's Governor, O. K. Allen, has come to Chicago by plane and is present incognito, and that last night Christenberry, who is now on the platform, was shot at while riding in an auto on South Shore Drive. Whether all this is true or not, it seems an organic part of the opera-bouffe. Meanwhile Dr. Townsend is outlining his ideas that youth must be trained for better citizenship, adult middle age must produce the wealth, and old age must be given greater buying power. After he receives his ovation, a resolution is introduced and passed that the O.A.R.P. make a concerted drive to proselyte the youth of the nation. Then the delegates leave the last meeting, Southern drawl flowing across ear-cracking Western r's, the unsounded r's of "down East" softening the Midwestern nasality. The folks are goin' home. They may never catch even a remote glimpse of Utopia, but whatever happens, they at least got to come to the Big Town and they had a damned good time—[illegible] of them this will be Utopia enough.

LICENSED TO ANZ ARCHIVE
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Where Roosevelt Stands Today

FOR MANY weeks there have been reports that Mr. Roosevelt is slipping in popular favor. They have had tangible consequences. They have greatly stiffened the backbones of business men, and intensified their attacks on administration measures. On the other hand, they have had a blighting effect upon plans for a third party. Many radical leaders—although not all—are beginning to feel that Mr. Roosevelt is perhaps the best defense against the coming to power of a reactionary Republican and the establishment of business fascism.

About the cocky self-assurance of business men and the fears of radicals there can be no doubt. Nor can there be any doubt that Mr. Roosevelt has dropped heavily in public favor since the overwhelming Democratic vote of the mid-term election a year ago. But whether this tide of hostility to Mr. Roosevelt will run at its present rate for another twelve months, and whether it will be sufficient to wash him out of the White House next year, seem to me less clear.

Last August in Rhode Island, the administration was put to the test of an actual election, and the Democratic candidate lost by about three to four. Immediately afterwards, Mr. Roosevelt and Postmaster General Farley intervened to prevent a second by-election in Ohio, something they presumably would not have done if they had not feared defeat.

The most authoritative of the recent polls taken to determine Mr. Roosevelt's popularity is probably that of the American Institute of Public Opinion, a private organization serving newspapers and advertisers. This shows a spectacular drop in Mr. Roosevelt's strength from 69 percent in February, 1934, to 50.5 percent in September, 1935. In October, however, the downward trend was reversed, and Mr. Roosevelt's strength rose to 53 percent. Confirming the result of the Rhode Island election, the Institute's poll shows only 38 percent of the voters in New England in favor of Mr. Roosevelt, and 62 percent against him. The Institute's regional percentages for the country are: New England, 38 percent; Middle Atlantic, 46 percent; East Central, 51 percent; West Central, 56 percent; Southern, 70 percent; Mountain, 65 percent; Pacific Coast, 56 percent. Another important and authoritative poll is now being held by The Literary Digest. Preliminary returns are said to show a startling proportion of voters opposed to Mr. Roosevelt.

Among less elaborate polls, the most interesting is that of the Gannett newspaper chain, the results of which apparently contradict those of the American Institute of Public Opinion. Taken among Eri- day-night movie audiences in nineteen cities — — gram and 15,294 votes against it. Seventeen of these cities are in upstate New York; the other two are Hartford, Connecticut, and Danville, Illinois. In the Institute's poll, pro-Roosevelt voters were in a minority everywhere in this area except Illinois.

Secret surveys of Mr. Roosevelt's popularity are made continuously by the Democratic National Committee. It has been rumored that lately they have shown a precipitous drop in Mr. Roosevelt's strength. The Democratic strategists in charge of the surveys, however, deny this. They admit that there has been a great falling-away among business men, but insist that among voters like chain-store or gasoline-station workers, for example, who are not immediately under the thumb of an employer, Mr. Roosevelt is as popular as he was in 1932.

The Rhode Island election, the various polls that have been taken, the Democratic National Committee's surveys, all show that a large number of people, perhaps a majority, are dissatisfied with their present lot and blame Mr. Roosevelt for it. What they do not show is whether the temper of the country is conservative or radical, or what policy third-party advocates should adopt. According to a separate survey of the American Institute of Public Opinion, 60 percent of the country is against "government spending," but it would be wholly unscientific to interpret this to mean that the imagination of the country might not still be caught by a coherent public-works program. A considerable part of the country is evidently prepared for a change. The question to be answered is whether the change is to be toward the right or left, and whether it is to be made under Mr. Roosevelt or under new leaders.

The so-called independent vote in this country, which customarily decides elections, numbers about seven millions, or approximately one-fifth of the electorate. A disproportionate share of these independent voters are women. All other people pridefully vote as their fathers did. The only issue that can unfailingly shake them loose from party loyalties is one that concerns religion. Great numbers of ancestor-worshipping Southerners, for example, became Hoovercrats in 1928 rather than vote for Al Smith. Almost certainly, there will be fifteen million congenital Democrats who will vote for Mr. Roosevelt next year, whatever he does. Many of them may dislike Mr. Roosevelt, but to vote for a Republican would make them feel strange and guilty. Because of the immense difficulty of capturing these hereditary voters, there are radicals who believe that a third-party movement cannot

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

this is true, it should not discourage radicals too greatly. If a third party could capture the independent vote alone, it could win up to eighty seats in the House of Representatives, hold the balance of power and put itself in a position to take office four years later.

It is emphatically necessary to recognize, however, that the independent voters are independent only in a highly qualified sense. The number of people who themselves appraise the national scene, and vote according to their own best interests, could form a club and meet in a telephone booth. Although independents move from party to party, they are almost wholly guided by loyalties—often unrecognized—to symbols and personalities. A minor element in the attitude of voters towards Mr. Roosevelt, for example, is Mrs. Roosevelt. It happens that she is a very definite symbol. To many people, the type of woman she represents constitutes all that is good and forward-looking in the community, and in others it evokes strong aversion. Almost always, these emotions are based on the individual past of the voters and are not susceptible to change through rational argument.

An immensely powerful symbol is peace. We are now heading into a period, if not of actual war in Europe and the Far East, at least of threats and alarms of war. Last summer, Mr. Roosevelt flatly refused to agree to legislation imposing a stringent form of neutrality on the country, which was advocated by the Nye munitions committee. Since the outbreak of the Italo-Ethiopian war, however, he has burglarized the Nye committee's program very efficiently, and there are many signs that he has a keen sense of its future campaign value. If by next summer Mr. Roosevelt can manage to make himself the symbol of peace, and in addition make his Republican opponent the symbol of possible war, he will win the election hands down. This is true, even though Mr. Roosevelt is the most fervent big-navy man ever to be President. In such a situation, a third party would face hopeless odds.

After peace, the most compelling symbol is that of prosperity-hard times. In 1932, Hoover had become the symbol of hard times, and nothing could have prevented his defeat. He had probably done as much for business as any President could have done, yet many business men—for example, the du Pont-General Motors-General Electric group—were against him. He had become a bird of ill omen, a black cat across the national path.

In the next election, Mr. Roosevelt will not symbolize hard times, and probably will not symbolize prosperity. Most authorities do not believe that there will be a solid improvement in business conditions, or even an inflationist boom, in the next twelve months. It is likely that the prosperity-hard times symbol will have little or no part in the 1936 election. Nevertheless, it must be recognized that if a boom gets under way, no matter how rickety the unlikely event that it led to a decrease in unemployment, thus strengthening the labor movement, it would also aid a third party.

There are many other symbols of political importance, but none with so decisive a part in swinging the independent vote as the principle of loyalty to personalities. An omniscient individual could very likely divide the whole United States into four categories: first, areas like Vermont or the deep South, where the hereditary voters dominate; second, rural districts where voters tend to follow a leading farmer or group of farmers; third, small towns where they tend to follow a banker or merchant; and fourth, the industrial sections of big cities, and purely factory towns, where they tend to follow either employers or labor leaders, depending on the degree to which organization has taken place. The process by which this comes about is largely unrecognized; it is based on the powerful impulse most people have to associate themselves with those whom they fear or admire.

Regrettable as it may be, the most powerful group of community leaders are the business men. Mr. Roosevelt's relationship to business is a peculiar one, and has consisted of alternating hostility and reconciliation. Only three major administration measures have not been largely consented to by business—the dissolution of public-utility holding companies, collective bargaining by labor, and work relief, in which is involved the issue of a balanced budget. The sharp shifts in Mr. Roosevelt's policies, however, have brought about a definite personal hostility towards him among big business men. Far from regarding these shifts as smart politics, they have given them an extremely harsh name.

Perhaps the most far-reaching political event in Mr. Roosevelt's term, so far, was his quarrel last May with the United States Chamber of Commerce. The Chamber is primarily the instrument of little business, of merchants and manufacturers in medium-sized and small towns. A faction within the Chamber, led by its current president, Harper Sibley, proposed a series of resolutions directed against the administration. Mr. Roosevelt chose to fight back with the ferocity of one of Haile Selassie's warriors after a lunch of raw meat. The result has been to transform the Chamber into an avowed propagandist organization against him. With other business groups, it has been the conduit by which the hostility of big business has spread slowly down through the whole business structure. As we saw above, the Democratic National Committee now admits the opposition of business men of all degrees. Spreading out from business leaders to their associates and employees, it is undoubtedly the strongest factor in the decline of Mr. Roosevelt's popularity registered in the poll of the American Institute of Public Opinion.

It must be kept in mind, however, that except [illegible] utility issue and the issues of collec-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vocable divergences between the administration and the majority of business men. This means that the rise of a formidable third-party leader who could bring about a fusion of the orthodox labor movement and the declassed small bourgeoisie—the Technocrats, Utopians, Townsendites, Share-Our-Wealth followers—could conceivably make business condone Mr. Roosevelt's erratic quality and rally behind him as its candidate. In this case, the Republican Party would be reduced to a remnant of hereditary voters.

Mr. Roosevelt's relationship with the farmers is the exact reverse of that with business men. More than three hundred thousand farm-community leaders now serve on the A.A.A.'s country crop-control committees. They manage the A.A.A., or at least, through Secretary Wallace's frequent referenda, are given the illusion of doing so. The fact that Wallace is not a New Deal slicker, and has brought the farmers into the A.A.A. not as a vote-catching stratagem, but because of his obviously sincere faith in democracy, has been only less helpful to Mr. Roosevelt than the distribution of crop-reduction checks. Mr. Roosevelt has done next to nothing for the sharecropper and farm laborer, and very little for the tenant farmer, but the community leaders of the farm areas are for him, and their support is decisive. Protests against the A.A.A., now being publicized by the Republican Party, come largely from hereditary Republicans. Every poll yet taken gives Mr. Roosevelt a majority in the farm states, and it seems unlikely that he can lose them next year.

The final group of leaders with power to influence great numbers of their fellows are the heads of the labor movement. At the beginning of the present administration, a tacit bargain was entered into between Mr. Roosevelt and the A.F. of L. Mr. Roosevelt promised to give labor minimum wages, maximum hours and the right of collective bargaining, and in return the A.F. of L. agreed to drop its traditional non-participation in politics and give him its active support. Minimum wages and maximum hours disappeared with the Schechter decision, and it is generally feared that collective bargaining, as it now exists under the National Labor Relations Board, will shortly be ended by the Supreme Court. If this happens, the substance of the bargain between the administration and organized labor will be destroyed.

At the recent A.F. of L. convention at Atlantic City, the feeling was widespread among the rank and file that labor had somehow been cheated. This feeling found expression in a resolution, carried in the last few seconds of the convention, demanding that Mr. Roosevelt support a labor amendment to the Constitution. In the event of further adverse Supreme Court decisions, it is possible that Mr. Roosevelt's attitude toward a labor amendment will determine whether the existing bonds of loyalty between him and Will[illegible] other A.F. of L. leaders will be severed or maintained. At least this is what ought to happen. There have been occasional doubts within the A.F. of L. as to whether government aid in union organization does not contain the danger of eventual government control. But if these doubts are ignored, Mr. Roosevelt's espousal of a labor amendment would give organized labor a sharply defined, concrete stake in his success. It would make valid the present allegiance to him among A.F. of L. chieftains and revivify this loyalty through the ranks.

It must be recognized that this would mean the postponement of a third party for another four years. This would not, however, be so great a tragedy as the present situation, in which labor and its radical and liberal allies are giving bewildered support to Mr. Roosevelt without any assurance of benefit other than his smiling benevolence. By agreeing to vote for Mr. Roosevelt in return for a labor amendment, labor would obtain, in the event of his reëlection, the fulfilment of one of its major demands, and would have avoided the hazards of a third-party venture.

One other group of community leaders deserves brief mention. These are the professional politicians. Because of his emergency expenditures, Mr. Roosevelt has been able to distribute far more patronage than any other peacetime President. The workers in the New Deal agencies alone, together with their families and relations, probably can muster a million votes, or enough, if properly distributed, to swing a national election. The newly born vigor of the Democratic machine in heavily populated, industrialized areas like Pennsylvania and Illinois—particularly Pat Nash's machine in Cook County—may be a considerable factor in next year's campaign. Certainly it is safe to predict that the $4,000,000,000 work-relief fund will offset the fund that the Republican Party will raise among business men.

As things stand now, it seems to me that there is little to substantiate either the confidence of business men or the fears of radicals. Mr. Roosevelt is certain of the Solid South, and reasonably certain of the farming West. He has the opposition of business men, but any economic improvement will tend to blunt and divide this. If Mr. Roosevelt honestly bids for labor and left-wing support, he should be able to carry the one or two Eastern states needed to assure his reëlection. It is clear, however, that Mr. Roosevelt's relationship both to business and to the labor movement is still tentative and amorphous. It is still possible—although time is slipping away rapidly—for a carefully planned third party to sweep up his left-wing support, perhaps to split the Democratic Party and to leave him the candidate of conservatism and business. That no leader for such a third party is in sight, and that no basis has been laid for its organization, is partly due to the faint-heartedness of those who stand on the left

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Working for the Government

II: *The Problem of Training Men for the Public Service*

NEARLY forty colleges and universities are preparing to "train for the public service." Some have done no more than reëxamine and, if it seemed desirable, revise their curricula in the light of two undeniable facts: (a) the government is now undertaking many new tasks; and (b) a growing percentage of students think of seeking some of the growing number of government posts. Other colleges are more ambitious. Recognizing that there is a need for efficient administrators in the public service, colleges propose to train them. Questions inevitably suggest themselves.

Is there anything about the public service that requires the special training of persons who wish to enter it? For doctors, lawyers, engineers, statisticians—surely there should be the one professional training irrespective of whether they hope to work for the government or to have private clients or employers. No engineering school would want to graduate a man trained only for the engineering tasks government departments might require.

Therefore, no one contemplates material changes in the curricula of professional schools. The "training" that is now being planned for is training for administration. In the minds of the prospective trainers looms an American counterpart of the administrative class of the British Civil Service. The annual recruits in England are among the best of the annual crop of university graduates, and the competition is double: between the graduates who take the examination, and among the government, university faculties and other professions for the best of the graduates. If the federal government should seek such persons, certain American universities are ready to give the necessary training.

Passing the question of whether it is presumptuous of professors to offer to train for something that, save in exceptional cases, they have not themselves practised, I suggest that, if the British administrative class is really the model, there is a gap in the logic. For the British administrative class there is no special training. The theory underlying it is still the theory stated by Macaulay a century ago: "Whatever be the languages, whatever be the sciences which it is in any age and country the fashion to teach, those who become the greatest proficients in those languages and those sciences will generally be the flower of the youth, the most acute, the most industrious, the most ambitious of honorable distinctions."

Hence the examination in England does not cover [illegible] prospectus of one school calls attention to the fact [illegible] scientific bureaus in Washington contain

come efficient administrators even though on entering the service they are ignorant of the technique of their chosen occupation. It is doubtful whether a theoretical knowledge would enable them to qualify more rapidly. Moreover, time spent in the university on technique would lessen the time available for work best suited to develop qualities of mind and impart breadth of view. Albert Ballin, the Hamburg-American director, once declared that if he had a post in his company vacant, and of two candidates "one could read Homer and Virgil in the original and the other knew all the intricacies of bookkeeping and was experienced in all manner of stock-exchange and discounting transactions," he would take the former. Without any special training, then, the British have an excellent public service. We wish a service as good as the British. Therefore we will train specially for it, and the "training," I suspect, will consist in the main of courses in political science and public administration.

"Mistiness is the mother of safety," said Cardinal Newman. "Your safe man in the Church of England is he who steers his course between the Scylla of 'aye' and the Charybdis of 'no' along the channel of 'no meaning.'" There is considerable mistiness throughout large stretches of social science. It is sometimes difficult to determine how much matter lies behind the patter. The stressing of such subjects, therefore, to the subordination of the natural sciences, the languages, mathematics, history and English composition may fail to increase the intellectual temperature of students. It will interfere with the kind of training—varying in individual cases—that has been so successful in Great Britain. It may also reduce the amount of liberal education the successful entrant obtains before he gets into the public service. That educational background can hardly be too broad or too deep. In one respect, however, training schools for the public service can serve a real function. They can draw the attention of bright young men to individual posts that may be open. There is no necessity for this in Great Britain because admission into the administrative class is so highly prized that it is striven for. In performing the task suggested, training schools may be little more than employment offices, but even that role is not without importance.

One task at least schools should certainly not attempt to perform. They should not seek to make ordinary pillows out of peacock feathers. A recent

LICENSED TO WIZ.COM
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

specialists in particular corners of research fields. "As a class they are not interested particularly in the administration aspects of their work. It is therefore sometimes difficult for them to advance in rank so that they may secure salaries commensurate with their achievements." The school, therefore, will attempt "to qualify various technical specialists for eventual advancement to responsible administrative posts, such as that of bureau-chief." The proposal is apparently to ruin good scientists by making them mediocre administrators so that they may receive larger salaries. The way to deal with this matter is to revise salary scales within scientific bureaus so that the administrative head would not necessarily be the member of the staff most highly compensated. That has long been the rule in departments of intelligently directed universities.

In two respects, however, the welling interest in a better trained public service will have important results. It will give a great impetus to post-entry or in-service training. By some it is argued that only post-entry training is worth consideration. Whether or not this is an extreme view, no one will deny that in-service training can be highly valuable. Several promising experiments are already in progress: under the Department of Agriculture in Washington for certain groups of its employees, and under the University of Southern California for local officials in the area. These experiments are with groups, but in-service training can be made to vary according to function and even according to individuals. Sabbatical years, which are sometimes suggested, are unnecessary—even dangerous; but if attention from the top is directed to in-service training, possibilities will be many and fruitful. One Treasury expert might profitably go to a university to study economics. The administrative officer of the Department of State might be required to examine the organization of the British and the French Foreign Offices. If he did this, who would believe that he would not desire drastic reforms in the ancient building just west of the White House?

Again, the increased importance of government —its collectivist activities, and interferences in new fields—will have a profound influence on the curricula of all universities—even those that do not train for the public service. Macaulay referred to the subjects that in any age it was the "fashion" to teach. Educational fashions do not and should not change rapidly, but the fabrics of individual subjects are continually rewoven. Embroideries of illustration are selected by the test of what at the moment is novel or seems significant. It is tempting to speculate on the possible consequences in specific cases, but one example must suffice. Recognizing the fact that business men are to have more and more contacts with government, the Harvard School of Business Administration proposes to "enrich its training for private business by more emphasis on government [illegible]" supply the obvious need in business for men who have a sympathetic understanding of the philosophy, the methods and the point of view of government." May success attend the effort.

Finally, both schools and students should not forget that the opportunities for employment in the public service are extremely meager. Warnings to this effect have been posted by some institutions but the danger is that they will be ignored. One popular class in one of the forty schools will probably have more members than the positions that are open in any one year. Of the permanent employees in the federal service during 1933, less than five percent enjoyed salaries of $3,000 or more. Less than one percent had salaries of $5,000 or over. If there is too much training to meet a demand that does not exist and will not be created, the training schools will have the same fate as the miniature golf courses of yesteryear.

LINDSAY ROGERS.

This is the second of two articles by Professor Rogers on improving the government personnel.—THE EDITORS.

Hound

My friend!
riding—and where?
my friend
is cloaked in deaf air.

Blind to my wicket,
grimly around
he glances only
at his hound:

persistent heeler,
black;
but pursuing
a twisted track;

his eyes
red and wroth,
and on his lips
a froth.

Into the woods
they are gone,
my friend and his hound,
alone.

(Grave,
be deep
where love and madness
are to sleep.)

My friend
shall soon or late
return unshadowed.
I wait

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Washington Notes

The Real Purpose of the Georgia Jaunt—
Domestic Dumping for the A.A.A.?
—Mr. Farley Passes the Hat

THE DAY the Supreme Court hands down its decision on the A.A.A., in the opinion of many officials here, will be the most critical one in the administration's career. The invalidation of the N.R.A. was a blow to the administration's prestige, but politically it probably helped rather than hurt. If the A.A.A. is declared unconstitutional, it will be pure loss.

Apparently Mr. Roosevelt has decided to let the Supreme Court know how strongly he feels about the need for a favorable decision. A suit brought by the Hoosac Mills, a textile company, will be argued before the Court early in December. Last week Mr. Roosevelt announced that he had consented to attend a "home-coming" in Atlanta, Georgia, the day after Thanksgiving. No such Democratic celebration has been planned in the South in years. Two hundred Georgia cities and towns will declare the day a holiday. Excursion trains will bring a crowd estimated at two hundred thousand from all parts of the state. Arrangements have been perfected to keep Governor Talmadge, who is himself bringing suit against the A.A.A.'s Bankhead Act, in strict obscurity. On such an occasion, it will be only natural for Mr. Roosevelt to discuss the A.A.A., and tell of the national disasters that, from his point of view, it has averted. Over their orange juice next morning, the nine Justices will see his speech in their newspapers. It is a round-about but effective means of communication between coördinate branches of government.

The keenest attacks on the A.A.A. I have heard are those made by officials of the A.A.A. itself. Two possible shifts in the direction of A.A.A. policy have already been marked out. The A.A.A. has been greatly upset by the taunt that while the government restricts production of hogs and cotton, perhaps half of the population is without adequate food and clothing. Accordingly a plan has been discussed that, in effect, amounts to domestic dumping. At one time or another, most of the countries have taxed their citizens in order to give away their foodstuffs to foreigners. A.A.A. experts propose that America adopt a similar plan, but dump its foodstuffs and cotton at home.

Domestic dumping has, indeed, already been tried out. During the 1934 drought, the Federal Surplus Relief Corporation bought millions of pounds of beef and hogs and, after processing it, distributed the meat to relief families. It also purchased thousands of bales of cotton, part of which, made up into cloth, was used to make underclothing, and part used directly for stuffing mattresses. The new domestic-dumping plan goes slightly farther. It proposes that there be *no restriction on* the crops a farmer grows other than the stomachs of the twenty million individuals on relief, and their need for cotton clothing. In practice, this would not mean much of an increase for wheat farmers, since bread consumption, despite rising [illegible] would however mean [illegible] and vegetables. It would also mean that the South would need to ship abroad substantially less of its cotton. Processing taxes, instead of being paid to farmers for letting their land stand idle, would be paid for growing the food needed to give the unemployed an adequate diet.

It is far from being true that all factions among the A.A.A. officialdom are united upon the domestic-dumping program. Moreover, it has apparently been frowned upon by the President's political advisers. They argue, first, that it would be a tacit admission that the present wage scale under the work-relief program is inadequate, and second, that it would permit Republicans to accuse the administration of engaging in business. In point of fact, domestic dumping would operate almost completely outside the business system, although admittedly it would make the government the largest food distributor in the world after Soviet Russia. Simply because the plan remotely suggests Russia and Upton Sinclair's Epic plan, it will probably not be tried until after next year's election.

The other proposed shift in A.A.A. policy concerns land utilization. As the law now stands, all farmers raising the same crop, whether their land is fertile or poor, must reduce their acreage uniformly. A.A.A. experts are acutely aware that this is a wasteful arrangement, and that rich land ought to be fully used and poor land returned to grass and forests. Some time ago, they aided in working out a plan for Puerto Rico in which this problem was tackled head-on. Under the so-called Chardon plan, processing taxes from Puerto Rican sugar are retained by the authorities and used to buy up and redistribute farm land. The best land is assigned—at a price, of course—to sugar-cane growers. Less good land is assigned to selected farmers who, while not permitted to grow cane, are urged to raise food stuffs for Puerto Rico's overpopulated towns. The poorest land goes to subsistence farmers, who produce mainly for themselves.

A.A.A. officials doubt that the problem can be attacked in the United States in a similarly direct fashion. The range of agricultural commodities and the possible uses to which land may be put, are greater here than they are in Puerto Rico and require more elaborate planning. Then, too, it is unlikely that farmers here would willingly forgo their A.A.A. checks each year in order to make possible a long-term program for the benefit of their class as a whole. The Resettlement Administration, however, through its program of buying up marginal land, has made a tentative start toward dealing with the problem, and A.A.A. experts believe that ultimately the classification of farm land—and in many instances its redistribution—must be attempted.

Harassed government employees have revealed another attempt by the Democratic National Committee to shake them down for campaign contributions. Under federal law, Postmaster General Farley cannot directly solicit money from other government workers. In this case, letters asking for contributions were sent out by the Democratic Council of the District of Columbia, locally known as the "collection club." Such incidents seem slowly to be convincing government workers of the need to organize, and it is reported that one of the two existing government workers' unions plans a public protest.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Other People's Money

Advice from an Expert—Peace Is Nice, But—Why Not Glorify Machine Guns Next?

SINCE we have made several comments recently about the goings-on among what might be called the better element of the bar, it will be of interest to many, I am sure, to hear a great lawyer speaking before so highly respectable an audience as may be assembled in the Harvard Law School. Mr. Jerome Davis mentions the morsel in his excellent study of "Capitalism and Its Culture," which ought to be prescribed reading in every class in political science or economics. Mr. Davis describes the president of the American Bar Association in 1934 speaking in Harvard Law School to the budding attorneys assembled to receive his advice. I daresay Felix Frankfurter was there and did some wincing.

"The most important thing about law is getting business . . ." said the great lawyer. "Go to church even if it is hard to take. You'll meet a lot of nice people there. It isn't so important for you to see them as for them to see you. Now that's called the church racket. But what of it, as long as you're getting business in a quiet, genteel way."

To the President of the United States:

I was among those who read with glowing pride of the splendid celebration of Navy Day. And when I saw your letter on that occasion an idea sprang into my mind which I beg, in all humility, to pass on to you for what it is worth.

First, I ought to say to you that there was a time when my ideas of Navy Day were a little warped, to say the least. Somehow I had got the notion that war is a dreadful thing and that, while it was perhaps proper to arm ourselves against aggressors, there was nothing particularly pleasant or desirable *per se* in armaments. Perhaps I should say that I reasoned this way (it is not important save as an indication of what goes on in the minds of a lot of unthinking people): War is hateful. But all around us are predatory and unscrupulous nations. They may attack us at any time. Therefore we must have weapons. Among these weapons are battleships and submarines. These are lethal weapons of the first magnitude—dreadful in their execution, but necessary. Therefore, while we will yield to the necessity for arming, we ought to be careful not to let ourselves fall in love with the weapons. Whenever, therefore, I heard men protesting their love of peace and justifying their advocacy of armaments by their love of peace, and then giving the most ostentatious exhibition of their delight in the weapons, I have wondered if they were such genuine lovers of peace as they protested. Of course I did not suppose they wanted war, but they seemed to be so childishly fond of death-giving instruments of war that I found myself concluding that the love of peace was subordinate to their delight in the magnificence and glamor of war.

You will see that it was easy for me to go [illegible]

war, but actually glorifying them. Therefore, I came to imagine that Navy Day was in bad taste. It was employed to lavish upon our battleships, our destroyers, our submarines and all the paraphernalia of destruction a warm and tender sentimentality. It was a device, I supposed, for stimulating a love of this immense collection of destructive machinery. And so I was opposed to it.

But of course I must have been appallingly wrong about this. And so when I saw you on Navy Day sending your greeting to that part of our population which was so eagerly putting its arms around our big guns in affectionate caresses, I got an idea that I felt I should pass along to you. It has to do with your own fame. After all, the navy belongs to the other Roosevelts. Theodore was its father and you are only its fifth cousin. It's well enough for you to be gracious about Navy Day because we know what a simple and hearty delight you yourself take in the lovely big ships. But why should you play second fiddle to the other Roosevelts? Why shouldn't you have a day of your own? And therein lies my suggestion.

After all, the navy is not the only weapon we rely on to protect our shores and reveal our might. There are other weapons that are far more important and, for that matter, far more effective and deadly. In the last war we killed scarcely a single Boche with our navy. But we must have riddled hundreds of thousands of them with our machine guns. There is the real terror of war—the machine gun. And in the next war, as in the last, it will probably prove to be the most awful and respect-compelling of all the weapons. Now, lacking as we are in a navy, we are even more lacking in machine guns. Great as the machine gun is, it has not yet reached its final possibilities. What we need, therefore, are more machine guns and, as a prelude to this, a public sentiment toward the machine gun that will make it easier for the army to get plenty of them. This means in turn the development of a healthy, wholesome, affectionate sentiment about the machine gun. You know the propaganda technique. It could be easily worked. And so I propose that we have a "Machine Gun Day" as a kind of quasi-national holiday. It could be celebrated with speeches, patriotic hymns, the militia marching around with the machine gun carried aloft as the symbol of our muscular civilization. The little children in the schools could raise funds to present machine guns to the R.O.T.C. units in the larger schools. We could stage what I think has never been tried—a Sham Riot. And you could become known as the Father of the Machine Gun.

Of course there is too much sickly sentiment against poison gas now to use that for a celebration. But as we become more civilized we shall become more intelligent and we shall recognize that the most intelligent way to wage war is by the use of the most effective instruments. There was a very bitter feeling against the musket at first. But gradually as the statesman, the preacher and the manufacturer extended to the public a better understanding of the cultural values of powder and ball, this foolish squeamishness passed away. And so too we shall get more sensible about poison gas. Then it will be time to think of having a "Poison Gas Day." Meantime it can wait. So let us

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

In a Dry Month

SO FAR in the fall picture season, about the only cheery news is that dug out and decoded from the trade journals, where "Boss" 17 G, BIG IN CINCY, or CRAWFORD BIG $21,000, BALTO, will tell disbelievers that a theatre in Cincinnati claims to have taken $17,000 away from the people in seven days' run of that weak sister in pictures, "She Married Her Boss," and that in Baltimore they report having shaken twenty-one thousand depression dollars out of a week of Joan Crawford in "I Live My Life."

Otherwise, Hollywood has had a rather sad, solemn look for quite a while. Much of its fall offensive seems to have been massed along the front of old and weighty matters—Shakespeare, for example, the Crusades, the blowout at Pompeii, the Opera—where the movies are a trout in a dustbin, busy, goggle-eyed, but somewhat at a loss. And even when Hollywood has been working in its own element there has been a noticeable spirit of boredom. So that now we have a good picture again, it is a cheerful sight.

"Hands Across the Table" is the new Paramount picture, a smooth but natural job, a happy mixture of brainwork and horseplay and a reminder that when intelligence goes for a walk among even the oldest props, the props may come to life. The plot here is Group A, Subtype 11-c: (A) he falls for her at the start yet remains in a state of falling all through the picture, suspended in midair like the floating-hat trick; (11-c) he is a rich young scion and she is a poor young shoot. Add complications AX2 and BOP: he has to marry the society page, she is loved by kindly gent with million, who would take her under the wing of his yacht for life. Originally a story by Viña Delmar.

But the film people have somehow beveled and canted and trued it up at just the right places until it is a natural airy structure, mostly well founded. The girl was hardboiled, suspected this business of love (where did it get her mother?); the boy was the son of big money but did not have any ("Maybe you, uh, heard about the Big Crash? Well that was, uh, us") and was also hardboiled, out to make a living and marry it. They met, decided they were of no use to each other, and proceeded to hang around together for a while, having fun. And most of the picture develops out of that, moving along from give-and-take to tenderness at an easy, smart clip. And without plugging sentiment too hard or taking too seriously the thesis of love triumphant in spite of itself, it is able to wind up still doing nothing in particular, very plausibly.

The trouble and the danger with light comedy as a rule is that it is self-conscious over its lack of weight and either leaves reality altogether in an attempt to be capricious and unexpected about everything, or fastens on each excuse for feeling with a hollow and forced semblance of deep emotion. That "Hands Across the Table" keeps the delicate and hard balance between these two courses of procedure is partly the work of direction, cutting, dialogue writing; but considerably the work of Carole Lombard and Fred MacMurray.

In this picture these two make an all-time copybook example of how to play a movie for what it is worth, with subtlety, much resource in the matter of visual expression, all, the deciding factor in whether the whole business of dinner for two, with hiccups, the evening with its last lap in the taxi, shall end up as a collection of comedy ideas or as smooth development of the situation, a successful piece of fancy; and whether the faked call from Bermuda shall be a mere crutch for the plot or straight comedy in itself; and whether roofs, stars, etc., are mere stage properties or what makes the world go around.

But it would be unfortunate if we got too much stress on acting here, because "Hands Across the Table" is a first-rate piece of film management. Some stretches are handled pretty much as vaudeville blackouts (especially the part where MacMurray answers the girl's door in his drawers and scares the dumb gentleman friend out of his candy and plenty else, the whole ending in a merry pratfall down the stairs), there is an occasional heavy touch, and the whole idea of getting Ralph Bellamy in to sound his hollow changes on the role of old Mr. Sweetly-kindly is about as germane as a saucerful of warm milk in a glass of beer.

But these are instances merely: in the run of the film there is a shrewd genius for effect through understatement—all sorts of touches like the action when MacMurray leaves the apartment after a sleepless night and you see him stop to look after the milk wagon in the block, the camera looking down through the morning air from over the girl's shoulder. No comment, no superfluous footage. But the hint has been planted, and will later underline the scene where he says he is going to get a job if it kills him, he could deliver milk, couldn't he. Or take the summing-up of that first night, when they had hiccups at dinner, such a lovely time only it had to be the last, and she sits on the edge of the bed after it is all over, all played out, catches suddenly on a hiccup in her throat, and breaks down crying like a kid.

These things taken by themselves are not much, but they indicate a wisdom of procedure that it is good to find in pictures, where careless use of camera devices, the didactic cutting in of wheels, clocks, calendar leaves and what not, and all march-of-timing and Eisensteining in general, are often confused with intelligent and true exploitation of the medium. And the picture itself is not much (builds no Dnieperstroys), except that it is a good one, a rain in a dry month and incidentally a certain advance in film treatment. Whatever its label may indicate in the way of old stuff to those who count on reading the label, it is encouraging to remember that anything which is delightful is never old in any real sense of the term, because delight is a fragile and immediate thing, and new always.

In newness as such, the latest thing is "The New Gulliver," a sort of tri-dimensional animated cartoon. Its makers were more concerned with mechanical problems than with its persuasive motion as a picture: the plot is thin and hasty, the satire of the kind that will say Pie-face, Pie-face, Pie-face, Pie-face, until the words lose meaning. I liked the tinny bustle and Rube Goldberg complications of the eating scene; also the monstrous machines in the factory, the police cars, pompous marches, etc. The puppets are marvels of invention, but an invention that stops with the still photograph. Taken as an experiment it is valuable; taken as a high-water mark in films it gets a bit absurd—

CONVERTED TO NZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

Another Scottsboro Case?

SIR: On October 14, the Supreme Court of the United States granted a petition to review by writ of certiorari a decision by the Supreme Court of Mississippi that three Negroes, Ed Brown, Henry Shields and Yank Ellington, convicted of first-degree murder, were not denied due process of law. The facts revealed in the official record of the case seem to demand public attention.

Raymond Stewart, a white man, was found murdered in his farmhouse on March 30, 1934. That evening the defendant Ellington, who lived on the Stewart property, was taken from his home by state officers, severely whipped and twice hung by his neck from a limb of a tree in an effort to force from him information concerning the murder. (Official transcript of record: pages 69-70, 107-108, 111-112.) The defendants Brown and Shields were next arrested, taken to jail, stripped and whipped with a strap that had a buckle on the end, until they confessed. (Record: pages 43-47, 60-61, 102, 105-106, 113.) Later, Ellington was arrested and on the way to jail was whipped until he too confessed. (Record: pages 70-114.) The whippings were admitted at the trial by the state officers (record: pages 101-106, 110-114), Deputy Sheriff Dial characterizing them as being "not too much for a Negro; not as much as I would have done if it was left to me." (Record: page 112.)

The nature of the confessions is illustrated by the testimony of the defendant Brown: ". . . They put me down three times. Two times I said 'No, sir.' Until the last time, I said: 'I ain't never harmed Mr. Stewart in my life.' They said: 'Get down again.' He took the strop away from the little fellow and it looked like he was going to kill me, and I said 'Yes, sir.' He said: 'What about the lamp?' I said: 'I don't know.' He said: 'Put him down again' and I said 'Yes, sir.' He was whipping me so hard I had to say 'Yes, sir.'" (Record: page 45.) . . .

Less than twenty-four hours after the whippings, the defendants were called before the sheriff and gave the "voluntary confessions" admitted at the trial. (Record: page 21.) The sheriff admitted he had heard of the prior confessions and knew at the time that the defendants had been whipped. (Record: page 24.) Shields was limping and could not sit down (Record: page 24); marks of the rope on Ellington's neck were plainly visible and the sheriff admitted that during the questioning he suggested that certain of their answers were "unreasonable" and that then the defendants changed them. (Record: pages 23-24.) . . .

The trial court ruled these confessions admissible after a preliminary hearing at which their competency was contested but at which the defense introduced no evidence of the beatings. Later, when the facts were brought out, the defense counsel failed to move to strike out the confessions. Because of this failure to say the proper words at the proper time, though the facts were finally known to everyone at the trial, including the prosecuting attorney and the trial judge (Record: page 176), the Supreme Court of Mississippi affirmed the trial court's judgment.

This result seems even more appalling in the light of the circumstances in which the defendants obtained their counsel. Five days after the murder, the defendants were indicted; two days later they were tried. Counsel were appointed by the court the afternoon before the trial, were given only time for a hurried conversation with the defendants before they were taken to jail and while conferring with them on the following morning, were several times interrupted by the court requesting them to "hurry up and get on with the trial." (Record: page 147; affidavit of defense counsel John A. Clark.) The counsel appointed were so loath to defend the Negroes that they flipped a coin to determine which one would publicly challenge certain of the talesmen; one of them has sworn that he was told by the officers that the Negroes had voluntarily confessed and that before the trial began he believed them guilty. (Record: page 148.)

This lack of opportunity for adequate representation by counsel [illegible] no request was made by counsel for additional time to prepare for the trial. The correctness of the decision of the Supreme Court of Mississippi in the light of prior Mississippi precedents is questionable, but it is too late for such arguments. The question now to be decided is whether the constitutional rights of the defendants have been violated.

Counsel for the petitioners supplied by the National Association for the Advancement of Colored People argue that the knowing use of illegal evidence coerced from the petitioners by state officers through physical violence constitutes a fraud on the defendants as serious as that condemned by the Supreme Court recently in the Mooney case. They argue, moreover, that there was here as effective a denial of counsel as that which resulted in a reversal of the first Scottsboro conviction, and point to the failure to move to strike out the confessions as evidence of the half-heartedness and ineptness of the defense afforded them.

RALPH T. SEWARD.
International Juridical Association.
New York City.

Watch It, William

SIR: For heaven's sake, will somebody please tip off Elsie Robinson to watch herself. Elsie writes "Listen, World!" for the Hearst readers afflicted with soul trouble. The Big Boss has an anti-Red drive on, and I, for one, wouldn't want her deported to Russia for writing what she did in her column printed in The Chicago American, October 17, 1935. "For no man can really use his life," she agitates, "to the full without running risks, accepting responsibilities, asking questions, making experiments, staging riots and leading rebellions. These things we all must do if we would really live—yet no one can do them without making mistakes." Those are Elsie's own words. No kidding.

Pekin, Ill. FRED HAMANN.

Getting the Most from the Land

SIR: Aside from giving a distorted representation of findings regarding the maximum number of persons who can be sustained by a unit area of land (the distortion arising from quoting a passage out of its context), in reviewing "Nations Can Live at Home" in the October 30 issue of The New Republic, Secretary Wallace makes only two points that prompt a comeback by the author. One is that the scientists, engineers and chemists who have been contributing to the development of modern agrobiology are merely letting loose upon us their fantasies and lurid imaginings. The other point is that if there is anything substantial in this business of mathematical agrobiology, it has been developed rationally by the late Dr. W. J. Spillman in a publication recently issued by the Department of Agriculture.

As regards the first point, the agrobiologists need only refer the inquiring reader to the facts. It has now been abundantly shown that the common crop plants possess enormous powers for growth. Anyone who takes the trouble to collate the records and performances of master farmers in all countries can easily convince himself that corn yields can be (and are) pushed up to 200 and more bushels, wheat to 120 and more bushels, potatoes to 1,000 and more bushels, cotton to 3 and more bales, beet sugar to 7 tons, per acre. No one need expect to see such yields turned out from any but the most skillfully managed farms, where the farmer is in full command of resources necessary for applying adequate quantities and proportions of water and fertilizer, and everyone can do his own imagining as to what might happen to existing agricultural policies when farmers generally, or even a substantial proportion of the best farmers, begin really to farm scientifically.

Mr. Wallace is stirred to amusement by one passage of the

LICENSED TO WIZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

the author has invited the reader to contemplate the eventual conversion of corn fields into vast lawns which, under agrobiological management, will yield more and better stock feed than an equal area of the best corn land, even though the corn were cultivated by the most skillful agrobiologists. In allowing himself to smile at this concept Mr. Wallace plainly does not have in mind current developments in grass-land management as reflected in publications of dozens of agricultural-experiment stations in this country and abroad, and he evidently has not inspected farms not more than a day's ride from his own home town.

The other point in Mr. Wallace's review that will not be left unchallenged is the assertion that "Dr. Willcox is laboring fantastically in the field that the late Dr. W. J. Spillman developed rationally." Anyone reading the Spillman bulletin cited by Secretary Wallace will discover that it related merely to the mechanics of the construction of yield curves (a field discovered and developed years previously by the German agrobiologist Mitscherlich), and that Spillman's work is completely barren of any hint of that outstanding achievement of modern agrobiology: the discovery of the maximum productivity of land.

It is this portentous discovery, to which no publication originating within the Department of Agriculture has yet made direct or indirect allusion, that the writer has essayed to popularize in such books as "Reshaping Agriculture" and "Nations Can Live at Home."

Ridgewood, N. J. O. W. WILLCOX.

Proposals for Work Relief

SIR: Out of forty-four proposed white-collar work-relief projects Mayor LaGuardia rejected forty-four as not worth while. Since our highly developed civilization has already taken care of all basic needs, such plans must by necessity offer a kind of luxury of public service. May I suggest some plans that nevertheless would be highly useful and, what is more, would create something lasting for the future.

The Hall of Fame.—At present it takes an appalling amount of time to get the material about any prominent living person. Establish an institute that collects everything published about all outstanding persons: biographies, diaries, autobiographies, articles, pictures, keeping the material up to date. After the living have been taken care of, the dead could be added. . . .

Bureau of General Information.—Establish a bureau to which anyone could come with any question under the sun and get information, either by employing a staff of research workers or by referring the clients to the proper place of inquiry. . . .

Farm Recreation Service.—Many persons in the city would like to rest at a quiet place in the country and many lonely farms would welcome cash and company. Establish an office that lists all farms in the state willing to take in one or several guests, with accommodations and prices offered and the means to get there. . . .

Our Alaskan Settlers.—They have a hard and lonely life before them. Establish a "fund of friends of Alaska" all over the country, giving illustrated lectures in clubs and depositing the collections in local banks, these collections to be used as a fund to send birthday parcels, books, periodicals, clothes to the settlers. . . .

Work Relief Periodical.—Establish a monthly periodical with illustrated reports of all work-relief projects, giving each of the forty-eight states and Alaska a page.

New York City. ELSE TORGE DOUGALL.

From The New Republic Mail Bag

Albert V. Fowler of Syracuse, New York, expresses consternation over the recent appearance of Bainbridge Colby, former Secretary of State and present disciple of Hearst, as chief speaker on one of the nationwide radio programs of World Peaceways, Inc. Mr. Colby presented a jingoistic plea for greater armaments as the proper road to peace and in general spoke like a Hearst editorial. Mr. Fowler was so concerned that he wrote Mrs. Estelle Sternberger, executive director of World Peaceways, who said that they hoped never again to present such extremist views as those of Mr. Colby.

A. S. Hancock of Trenton, New Jersey, recommends an amendment to the Constitution providing that "no war shall be declared except by the consent of the majority of the American people" shall be allowed to stand. . . . Mr. Bernard Baley sends us a copy of an open letter to Booth Tarkington in which he chides Mr. Tarkington for the "middle-class prejudices" revealed in his works and for his indiscriminate opposition to radicals and all forms of economic change. . . . Mrs. Agnes Morgan of Miami, Florida, bitterly assails The New Republic for what she regards as our partisanship in favor of Secretary of Agriculture Wallace. She says that farmers would have made more money if they had been permitted to continue unrestricted production of whatever crops they wanted without benefit of A.A.A. payments. She doesn't say what might have happened to agricultural prices under these conditions. . . . Gilbert Wilson calls attention to the fact that martial law is still in effect in Terre Haute, Indiana, following the general strike there last summer, and says that the general political conditions in the city are deplorable. The city administration has been accused of nepotism, graft and inefficiency and the citizens are restive under continued military control.

Louise R. Bransten of the Committee for Ethiopian Independence, which was initiated by the American League Against War and Fascism, reports that the Committee received strong endorsement and support from influential labor leaders at the recent A.F. of L. Convention in Atlantic City. . . . Herbert M. Harris of Los Angeles, California, urges the appointment of an impartial committee to investigate the Consumers' Research strike. He believes that the record of Consumers' Research in exposing the evils of capitalistic exploitation is such that it would be a tragedy indeed if the strikers were found to be seeking merely personal gain and not striking for general labor principles. He takes no sides in the controversy, but as a liberal-minded person he is dismayed at the apparent spectacle of two divisions of the same liberal army fighting each other, and would like to see facts impartially brought out.

Redfern Mason, candidate for mayor on the United Labor ticket in San Francisco, sends us some tidings of his campaign in which progressive, liberal and radical elements have achieved a strong united front. Newspapers are fighting the Labor ticket with a conspiracy of silence and the Board of Education has suddenly put through a rule saying that any school teacher who engages in political activity will be immediately discharged. Sympathizers are invited to send contributions to the United Labor Campaign Committee, 747 Market Street, San Francisco. . . . James Myers writes on behalf of the American Friends' Service Committee, which has been doing notable relief and rehabilitation work in the coal fields of Ohio, Pennsylvania, Kentucky and West Virginia, that funds are needed for carrying on the winter's activity. Contributions may be sent to the Coal Areas Committee, Room 612, 105 East Twenty-second Street. New York City. . . . The Tom Mooney Molders' Defense Committee writes that funds are urgently needed to meet the expenses of the present long court hearing and asks that sympathizers send contributions in any amount, however small, to the Defense Committee, P. O. Box 1475, San Francisco, California.

The National Sacramento Appeal Committee, formed to aid the eight union organizers convicted in Sacramento, California, under the criminal-syndicalism law, sends us a photostatic copy of a letter issued by the California State Chamber of Commerce calling upon business men of that state to contribute to a war chest for smashing organized labor. The Appeal Committee is seeking to collect its own funds with which to resist this reactionary drive of the State Chamber of Commerce. The Committee's letter is signed by Harry W. Laidler, John Chamberlain, John Dewey, James Rorty and Oswald Garrison Villard and they ask that contributions be sent to the National Sacramento Appeal Committee, Room 707, 41 Union Square, New York City.

Francis A. Henson sends an anouncement of the forthcoming publication of Race, a new quarterly devoted to political, economic and social equality, with editorial offices at 20 Vesey Street, New York City. Genevieve Schneider is managing editor and the editorial board consists of Martha Gruening, Francis A. Henson, Loren Miller, Henry Lee Moon, Sterling D. Spero, George Streator and Bertram D. Wolfe.

The Henri Barbusse Memorial Committee sends notice of an anti-war dinner to be held on Friday, November 15 at the Aldine Club, 200 Fifth Avenue, New York City. Heywood Broun and

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Dead End

I

Mr. Norman Bel Geddes

Dead End, by Sidney Kingsley. Belasco Theatre, October 28, 1935.

On the décor side, the fact that "Dead End" is at the Belasco Theatre makes an odd comment. You look at that scene with its high walls, its divisions, its reproduction of what the play's actual locality might be, you see the multiplication of details, the number of people, et cetera; and then, exactly as you would expect, you hear in the lobby comparisons with Belasco's settings. You hear that the literal detail and the solidity, up and down, back and forth, of this new setting is like what Belasco settings used to be; for example, the astonishing scene for "Mimi" (1928).

As a matter of fact, there is all the difference in the world between such a Belasco setting and that of Mr. Norman Bel Geddes for "Dead End." But it is a difference harder to achieve and harder to describe than the difference between the Geddes "Dead End" setting and the Robert Edmond Jones design for "Pelléas and Mélisande." In the latter case the jump is away from the literal toward a free, ideal or abstract problem, while Mr. Geddes is partially tied up with actuality. The difference between the Belasco and Geddes problems is another matter. The problem here is to raise the actual scene, with all its actual details and surface facts, to a plane where it begins to be art, to heighten, eliminate and stress so that in the whole result we have what we did not have before.

This I am saying is not in any way to depreciate Belasco's achievements in theatrical settings. There came a time, of course, as was inevitable, when the smart thing was to say that the "Master" merely had a bag of tricks to give us, beginning with the squeak of the elevator outside or culminating in such an overwhelming stage structure as he built for "Mimi." This type of Belasco realism, however, was quite as theatrical as Mr. Geddes' set in "Dead End." The difference is one of levels. The theatrical quality of the Belasco setting consisted in its ingenuity and profusion; its appeal lay in its surprising, enthusiastic and reckless duplication of actuality. It is an appeal not necessarily ignoble, though it may be childlike. The labels on the cherry trees, for instance, in another Belasco production, could scarcely be thought a detail of much importance, and might even interfere with the play itself: but such things on the stage do reach back to one of the first delights in the theatre. I mean the joy of seeing the same thing born anew with a nameless difference, like the moon in water, or like the charm in a portrait, as Pascal said, of presence and absence. It is the plane of the translation that counts against Belasco. This was partly the result of the period in which he flourished and so long outlived; partly the result of an essential lack of taste—how many in the theatre then or now have shown it?—and partly because he never knew that the theatre can mean much beyond sheer theatre, and, accordingly, could either take a light piece and weigh it down with scenic baggage or could divert a deep dramatic moment from its true course by burdening it

To say, therefore, that Mr. Geddes' set is like one of Belasco's is both true and absurd. Both are attached to realism, but the reality in Mr. Geddes' scene for "Dead End" is completely restated, is dramatic in the finest sense, and is given a superb separation from its original material. By force of emphasis it becomes more convincing than actuality. And, though few persons there might know it, the gasps and applause of the audience when this setting is first revealed, are not so much that the scene is so like any actual scene as that so many actual scenes appear to be swept up into and expressed in this scene. It could not be any actual place, but any actual place could be it.

The only competition in excellence that this scene has had this season is Mr. Mielziner's "Winterset" design of the bridge with its arches. Photographs can show none of its subtlety, but only its mass; this setting is not only a matter of the arch but also of the lines and planes and nearby walls as they stand before us. But no really direct comparison is suitable here between the "Winterset" and "Dead End" designs. Mr. Mielziner's set is in the Robert Edmond Jones school. There can be no competition between Mr. Mielziner's and Mr. Geddes' settings except a competition with regard to excellence—in quality—the quality in each case being more or less dictated by the essential demands of the play.

The scene demanded of Mr. Geddes is one that calls for docks, tenements, a street and the gate of a luxurious apartment house, the place where people have yachts of their own, et cetera. We might compliment Mr. Geddes by saying that his scenery does not intrude on the play. Say, rather, that his setting is inseparable from the play or, still better, is an inseparable part of the theatre work presented. The actual setting displays a dock structure on the audience' right, a section of a building, a street at a slant from the line of footlights, then walls of houses, then the terrace and gate of the fashionable apartment house, all bounded in front by the edge of the dock and its piles, these latter superbly placed. The fundamental structure of the sixteenth-century Palladian stage perspective with its permanent settings, is implied, with the same admirable foreground for acting. The lighting was magnificent—for example, in the scene where the boys clustered at their card game, the whole scene and, especially, the half-naked boyish bodies, were suffused with a kind of amethyst light in which the gleaming of the flesh was as realistic as Murillo—of whom, partly because of the urchins, it may have reminded some of the audience. It was, in reality, as sophisticated and beautiful as one of El Greco's effects.

It is not mere lighting. The whole picture, with its composition in solid forms and color, was, as it were, overpainted with color in light.

Ten years ago we had in our theatre diverse plays, worthy or not, enjoying settings that were far beyond them in importance. And, since the theatre art is, among the arts, highly impure, made up of various arts in combination, we were accustomed to say that the décor, being the work of one man, could have a straighter chance for success than the rest of the production. Now, after seasons of very little of anything, plays, décor or what not, we must ask ourselves whether the designer of genius might not diversify himself

LICENSED TO UMZCIC
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

BOOKS IN REVIEW

What Kind of Freedom?

IN "LAND OF THE FREE"[1] Mr. Agar returns to the theme which he advanced in "The People's Choice," to the effect that in the conflict of social ideas among the fathers, represented in their extremes by the populism of Jefferson and the plutocracy of Hamilton, the democracy of John Adams was the golden mean. John Adams saw that political rights were useless unless backed by economic power. He wrote: "Power always follows property." Freedom, which is power over oneself, is therefore bound up with the possession of property, and in order that freedom may ring throughout the land it is necessary that "the majority of men should have ownership, or possible ownership, of the means of production." Such private property, says Mr. Agar, "makes for independence, makes for character, makes for the free society that America set out to be." Adams distrusted wealth in its power over the lives of others, but on the other hand he distrusted poverty: "He was convinced that expropriated men were not genuinely free, and that it would be a subterfuge to give them the form of political power." It is the tragedy of American history, in Mr. Agar's view, that instead of realizing the true "American dream" of the Adamses, we have gone whoring after two false gods, linking Hamilton's oligarchy to Jefferson's political democracy, "producing a combination that nobody had ever pretended would be good."

Mr. Agar makes use of Spengler's distinction between a culture and a civilization; the former being an early, creative, spontaneous period of growth in the social organism, the latter, a period in which creation has been replaced by manufacture, spontaneity has been succeeded by mechanization, society has become static and rigid. Mr. Agar, like Spengler, finds symptoms of this senility in the western world in the paralysis of rural and small community life, and the fevered activity of big cities. In America our genuine culture was bound up with the life of the former, which Adams would have preserved, and our "colonialism" is shown in our abandonment of our true way of life by the adoption, under Hamilton's crafty manipulation, of the economy of finance-capitalism in imitation of England. "America, be yourself," cries Mr. Agar.

To bring his countrymen to listen to that cry, Mr. Agar relies on the disillusionment of the last two decades, in which the driving of the plutocracy has run our civilization into the ditch. In his analysis of the present crisis in finance-capitalism he follows Mr. John Strachey, but to a different conclusion. "Production for profit has this in its favor: it *can* be made compatible with a free society. Production for use cannot." But production for profit under the system of finance-capitalism still means "dispossession for the large majority and dispossession still means the death of democracy." Hence the only chance for freedom is in the return to the horse-and-buggy days of wide distribution of property in the form of instruments of production, with keen competition, encouraging habits of both cautious thrift and daring adventure—the virtues of private enterprise and rugged individualism.

It is here in the constructive portion of his essay that one will question Mr. Agar's conclusions. Granting his definition of a free society, it may be asked whether such a society, so far as it ever existed, was not the result of conditions bound to be temporary, whether Hamilton actually was responsible for the plutocracy or Jefferson could have prevented it, whether large-scale production is not inherent in the machine age, and monopoly the legitimate offspring of laissez-faire. Mr. Agar lays much stress on the supposed inefficiency of mammoth enterprises as contrasted with small units subject to personal direction. This result, if proved in some cases, is on the whole illogical. Granting the enormous discrepancy between production and distribution costs, which Mr. Agar cites as convincing, it is clear that the surplus for advertising and marketing which ought of course to be passed on to the consumer, is really the result and the evidence of the low cost of production due to large-scale operation. Large-scale production obviously lends itself more easily to regulation in matters of cleanliness and purity. Who would desert the great meat-packing establishments for the old-time slaughter house, or the biscuit package for the old cracker barrel?

Mr. Agar argues that the power age, succeeding the machine age, will favor the small producer; but power supplements the machine; it does not replace it. Naturally he finds in the South, the part of the country most primitive in its methods of production and least subject to industrialization, the hope of American culture; and in the group called the Agrarians the most active promoters of his program, in their effort to restore farming as a way of life rather than as a business. It may be wise to rehabilitate 500,000 persons a year on subsistence farms at a cost of $30,000,000, as a means of meeting the present crisis in employment, but it may be doubted if all these persons will be permanently reconditioned or, if so, will be of the type to give a permanent tone to American culture.

Mr. Agar agrees with Mr. Lewis Douglas as to the cause of the present breakdown of capitalism. "The system has collapsed because men worked it greedily." But greed is akin to profit. To restrain the impulse toward accumulation among Mr. Agar's farmers and small manufacturers and storekeepers, as among Mr. Douglas' financiers and industrial monopolists and, above all, to obtain the full service of the national plant in production of goods needed by the people, the action of the state is necessary. Under regulation that prevents the owner of a farm or small business from selling his holding or buying another, or from wasting his resources by idleness, private ownership of the means of production will be a fiction, the value of which for the nurture of character is problematical. With such ownership of material things Mr. Agar identifies the idea of freedom necessary to make the individual a worthy citizen of the state. But suppose the state exists for the benefit of the individual. Personal freedom of a different kind may be conceived as compatible with vesting the ownership of the means of production in the state, which directs their operation to the lessening of toil, the increase of leisure, the assurance of economic security to its members. Obviously a degree of regimentation is necessary to win this freedom; but the right use of it in pursuit of the things that have intrinsic, rather than instrumental, value to the [illegible] may result in mitigating the rigors of civilization

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Unbalancing of Powers

The Diplomacy of Imperialism: 1890-1902, by William L. Langer. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. 2 vols. 820 pages. $7.50.

IN THESE two volumes Dr. Langer continues what promises to be the authoritative standard work on the diplomacy of Europe between the Franco-Prussian and the World Wars. The years 1871-90, discussed by Professor Langer in his "European Alliances and Alignments," were the years of undisputed German hegemony, when Bismarck succeeded through his system of alliances in keeping France isolated and humiliated. The shadow of the unfortunate peace treaty of Frankfort-am-Main overhung all following international relations much as did the peace treaties of 1919-20. Bismarck's alliances were directed not only against France, but also toward the strengthening of conservative and monarchic influences on the Continent. The year 1890 removed Bismarck's master hand from the active scene and by the Franco-Russian alliance reëstablished the balance of power in Europe.

But Europe was no longer the decisive battle ground of diplomacy. With the rapid industrialization of the Continent the scene had suddenly broadened: in the late eighties the aggressive energies and appetites of Europe overflowed Africa and Asia. The basis of this movement was as much intellectual as economic. The success of Bismarck's nationalistic military policy and the new biological conception of society created the new spirit of expansive activism, which appealed to popular sentiment even more than to the ruling classes. From 1815 to 1890 only Great Britain had been an imperial power, proud in her isolation and in her world-wide connections. After 1890 other powers entered the scramble for territories in a world shrinking fast from its former unmapped vastness into a well surveyed field for exploitation, conflict and colonial wars executed in the spirit of sporting expeditions.

Against this background Dr. Langer elucidates the complexities of European diplomacy in those years. His book is a scholarly work of outstanding merit, drawing for its account upon material in Russian, Armenian and Japanese not previously available in Western languages, and upon a remarkable wealth of contemporary periodical writing. By its stimulating interpretations and its forceful and straightforward style, it will interest the intelligent general reader, who will find in it again and again an illuminating parallel to, and an explanation of, present-day events. Although the book intends to be only a diplomatic history of Europe, it connects the foreign policy of the leading European powers with the general economic and intellectual development and the internal policy of those countries.

In the book—which takes us from the Near East to South Africa, from the Far East to the upper Nile, from Persia to the Congo—Mr. Langer reveals many unconventional points of view. His treatment of the Armenian question in this period is easily the most satisfactory I have found. The alliance between France and Russia, although it started as a defensive measure against the Triple Alliance, soon found itself directed not against Germany, but against England. The two systems of Continental alliances did not function properly in those years. The "interpenetration of alliances," as Professor Salvemini called this disintegration of the system, led again and again to a united front of Continental Europe against Great Britain. "She had the empire which the others coveted." Fear of a Continental league threatened especially during the Boer War and induced England to look out for an understanding with a Continental state. Mr. Langer proves that from 1894 to 1902 the real object of English policy was to come to an agreement with Russia, and that at the same time the most eminent Japanese statesmen also wanted an agreement with Russia. The failure of their efforts brought the two island empires in 1902 "rather reluctantly" together.

This year meant a turning point in the history of the diplomacy of imperialism. But it did not mean its end, as Professor Langer seems to think. He aptly describes the period of imperialism. "It was taken for granted that the world was marked out for exploitation by the white man and that the principle of every man for himself and the devil take the hindmost was natural law. The basic problem of international relations was who should cut up the victims." But when he goes on: "In our own day we have learned otherwise and all this now seems long ago," we can only admire his optimism.

HANS KOHN.

Small Talk on Large Forces

Our Lords and Masters, by the Unofficial Observer. New York: Simon and Schuster. 400 pages. $3.50.

"OUR LORDS AND MASTERS" is a huge, rambling, scrambling book that starts out by pretending to have a theme but soon forgets all about it and ends as a mere indiscriminate heaping up of random biographical facts and political interpretations, both often dubious in the extreme. The Unofficial Observer has, on the whole, observed to very little purpose.

He begins by listing the twenty-five rulers of the modern world, every one of whom, in spite of the advance of feminism, is a man. The roster includes five who "master the consciences of the mass of humanity"—King George, the Mikado, the Pope, Trotsky and Gandhi; eight "mundane political potentates," four generals and eight business men. Having thus announced the form of his book, the Observer proceeds to abandon form altogether. He obliges with a short bit of flesh-creeping on the next war, skips blithely to the probable future of the British empire, discusses various personages, and then from time to time returns to his theme.

It is diverting to know that the Emperor Haile Selassie weighs one hundred pounds; that the Japanese firm of Mitsui beat America to the chain-store system with "cash payments and a single price" a century before the American Revolution; that Mussolini soft-pedals the fact that he is a grandfather; that Mrs. Litvinov does not like the American diplomat, Hugh Gibson; but it is all disjointed, a late and weary example of the gossip book that came into fashion with Mrs. Asquith and the Gentleman with a Duster.

In addition to its prolixity and bad organization, the book suffers from an inaccuracy that is sometimes fantastic. The anonymous author thinks that the Versailles Treaty did not in the least trouble Krupps; whereas they had to transfer some of their most important trade to other countries. He thinks that "the girl who prefers the Cadillac to the cradle is the mother of a crisis," quite forgetting that large populations are one of the contributory causes for wars. He suggests that the Macedonians who killed King Alexander of Jugoslavia would also like to [illegible]

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

status of the Macedonians and their "Imro." He even errs in such a triviality as the origin of Greek-letter fraternities, which he attributes to a wave of sympathy for the Greek Revolution, quite forgetting that they date from 1776.

JOHN BAKELESS.

Forward, March!

Man the Unknown, by Alexis Carrel. New York: Harper and Brothers. 360 pages. $3.50.

DR. CARREL, whose recent discoveries in physiology made in collaboration with Colonel Lindbergh received wide publicity, is deeply upset by the lamentable state of our civilization. He thinks it is high time to create a science of man that shall conceive of all his functions as a unit. Though aware that our knowledge of man is "still too rudimentary to be useful," he sets out to found this science in the optimistic belief that biology "has revealed to us the most precious of all secrets—the laws of the development of our body and consciousness."

Dr. Carrel is particularly anxious to preserve science from the encroachments of mechanical thinking, which overlooks the "soul." Rejecting sociology and philosophy as unreliable, he pretends to build on the solid foundation of scientific facts. He repeatedly emphasizes the importance of distinguishing between successive stages of "organization of matter" and of using appropriate concepts at each stage. However, when he finally arrives at the core of his subject—the position of man in society—this excellent principle is forgotten. He does not even seem to realize that to speak intelligently of human affairs, specific concepts and also some knowledge of history are needed.

From what he considers a biological fact—and these "facts" are often questionable—Dr. Carrel immediately proceeds to a social line of action. Thus, for his purposes, the "separation of the population into classes . . . rests on a solid biological basis," and it is, moreover, "imperative that social classes should be synonymous with biological classes." Even if the first of these two propositions were true, the second still would not follow—for that matter, would be quite unnecessary. In a similar manner, from the hardly disputable fact that there are differences (physiological) between man and woman, he concludes that the *social* status of women should be different from that of men. Starting from the proposition that human beings are born unequal (physiologically), he thinks that they should also be unequal socially.

In the last chapter, suggestively entitled "The Remaking of Man," this confusion reaches disquieting proportions. Comparing human society to a herd, Dr. Carrell now demands the creation of an élite, because "the herd always profits by the ideas and inventions of the élite." This élite is of course to be dominated by the "sons of very rich men." The family must be strengthened as a social unit and our marriage customs must be modeled on those of the "higher anthropoids." Children should be educated like dogs, "that is, without argument, without discussion, without explanation. In a word, children must be conditioned." As to social order, "the conditioning of petty criminals with the whip, or some more scientific procedure, followed by a short stay in hospital, would probably suffice to insure order." It goes without saying that these lofty ideals are accompanied, as usual, by eulogies of beauty, [illegible] love, spiritualism, mystic raptures, asceticism, [illegible].

social reformer might have been even more disastrous, had it not been for his tender solicitude for "the unpredictable," which prevents him from mapping out a complete plan of action. Dr. Carrel refuses to "establish any program. For a program would stifle reality in a rigid armor. It would prevent the bursting forth of the unpredictable." Instead of bothering with programs and predictions, he terminates his book by putting forth a smoky slogan worthy of the hero for whom his admiration is boundless. The hero is Mussolini, and the slogan is: "Our destiny is in our hands. On the new road we must now go forward!"

NORBERT GUTERMAN.

Nemesis in the Cotton Belt

This Body the Earth, by Paul Green. New York: Harper and Brothers. $2.50.

HAVING established himself as one of the more important American playwrights, Paul Green now brings out a long and authentic novel about the plight of the white sharecropper in the South. "This Body the Earth," like Miss Elizabeth Maddox Roberts' "The Time of Man," is written from the outside looking in, but it demonstrates, as did the earlier book, that a member of one class may have a deep and understanding sympathy for a member of another. In spite of the structural defects that result from Mr. Green's attempt to impose the technique of the theatre upon the technique of the novel, it is an outstanding addition to the literature of social protest that is being written by Southern writers.

The story of "This Body the Earth" is simple enough. Alvin Barnes is the son of a trifling, shiftless, holy-rolling cropper. He realizes, as a young boy, that there can be a decency and dignity to human life and determines to rise above his class. He scrimps, works like a mule, tries to educate himself. Finally, a grown man, he acquires (on paper) a few acres of his own. He marries the prettiest girl he knows. All his dreams seem to be coming true. In time he will live in a big white house on a hill, he will ride in a carriage with yellow fringe, the Negroes will salute him as he passes. Then, suddenly, everything goes to pieces. His wife deserts him, he loses his little farm, a jury sends him to prison for crippling his wife's lover in a fist-fight. When he comes back from the torments of the prison farm he is a broken and defeated man, his lungs gone, his great strength sapped, fit only for the grave.

Alvin Barnes will probably be compared, reasonably enough, with that other cropper who came out of the South to become a Broadway tradition: Mr. Erskine Caldwell's eloquent and profane Jeeter Lester. Mr. Green's hero will be used, especially in the South, to prove that the subhuman Jeeter is an extreme case; that there are tenant farmers with deep wells of ambition and pride. Such contentions, of course, are true (always remembering that Mr. Caldwell has never contended Jeeter was "typical" of anything but himself and that the ultimate rightness of the patriarch of Horse Creek Valley cannot be denied); and because they are true, the tragedy of Alvin Barnes becomes even more heart-breaking. He is defeated, not by himself, but by the agricultural economy of the South. This economy, in Mr. Green's novel, becomes the Nemesis of the old Greek tragedies—merciless, vindictive, hounding a man to his death. The implicit moral is that the individual, no matter how rugged, cannot combat a system that makes

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

attention are those exposing the penal system of North Carolina—the whippings, the chain gang, the "sweat box." The description of a Negro prisoner's being whipped until his rump is lacerated and bleeding is not pretty to read and not pretty to remember. But it had to be written and it is sincerely to be hoped that these sections of "This Body the Earth" will serve the purpose for which they were obviously intended—the reformation of one of the most brutal and inhuman prison systems in the United States. Paul Green has written a brave, honest, eloquent book—his most important performance since "In Abraham's Bosom."

HAMILTON BASSO.

Music Ho!

Music Ho! A Study of Music in Decline, by Constant Lambert. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. 342 pages. $3.75.

ONE PROBLEM for the directors of orchestras like the Philadelphia or the New York Philharmonic-Symphony is to find conductors who will interest the public; another—and this one more serious—is to find music. Formerly a conductor could offer his audiences not only great music of the past but the music that was being newly composed. Today he is faced, on the one hand, with the fact that the interest of the public in some of the music of the past is diminishing. It isn't likely that the status of Beethoven, Schubert, Mozart, Haydn, Bach and Händel will change (though one may expect a more realistic attitude towards their less consequential works, such as Beethoven's violin concerto and some of the concertos, suites and sonatas of Bach). But Tchaikovsky has lost the enormous popularity that he had only ten or fifteen years ago; Brahms, who has taken his place, will also be played less in the future than at present, I think; and so will Wagner and Strauss. And on the other hand, nothing new is being produced that the conductor can incorporate into the standard repertory in their place, or that, in some instances, he can play even once without protest from his audience.

The sterility of the present period is something that not only has given conductors sleepless nights but has bewildered the public in many ways. The listener has been bewildered by the music itself, first of all. And having heard, let us say, a symphony by Von Webern for chamber orchestra, which sounded like a little squeak followed by a little toot, followed by a little whistle followed by a little squeak again, he has been further bewildered to read in The New Republic that it impressed Paul Rosenfeld as resembling "a Cézanne water-color, with its hair-line indications of essential contours." With critics in important places assuring him that they find the music significant, the listener has been willing to reject the testimony of his own ears that it is meaningless; yet nothing they have said has enabled him to hear the significance they have spoken of. Moreover, in the hope that understanding might lead to enjoyment, he has acquainted himself with the theoretic basis of the music, only to discover that understanding has not increased his enjoyment, and that what is perfect as an exercise in Schönbergian theory is not moving or interesting or even tolerable as a work of art. And so far from persuading him that the neo-Händelian or neo-Rossinian Stravinsky is as endearing as the Stravinsky of "Petrouchka," the tortuous explanations of Stravinsky's tortuous mental processes, in magazines devoted to symphonic

To the listener in this situation Constant Lambert's book, "Music Ho!" will come as a great relief—the relief of discovering, after he had been all but persuaded otherwise, that two and two do make four, the sun does rise in the east, and contemporary music is—in the opinion of a writer completely at home in it—as sterile and warped and stunted as it seems. Mr. Lambert, that is, discusses the nature of the impasse at which music has arrived, the ways in which composers have attempted to escape from this impasse, the reasons they have failed, and his idea of the way out. The detail of this discussion—which delights one repeatedly with his acuteness and with the way he puts things into words—cannot be summarized or paraphrased; it would have to be quoted by the page, and is best left to be read. Some of it is too clever or otherwise open to question or disagreement; and I am not saying that Mr. Lambert is without faults, or the book without flaws, but merely calling attention to it as a book that deals with an important situation, and deals with it, for the most part, extremely well.

B. H. HAGGIN.

A Social Process

The Sociology of Invention, by S. C. Gilfillan. Chicago: Follett Publishing Company. 204 pages. $2.50.

THIS IS one of the most acute and sensible books that have been written on the subject of invention. Its author has specialized in following the development of a single invention, the boat—set forth in another book, "Inventing the Ship"—and from his observations here, combined with a pretty wide knowledge of recent inventions, he does a fine job in demolishing the elaborate mythology that has been built up about invention and the inventor and the so-called machine age. He shows that invention is part and parcel of the common social process, not a new faculty suddenly discovered in the eighteenth century; he shows that while fundamental changes appear suddenly and fitfully, usually the work of outsiders, improvements come about by steady accumulation and are therefore usually the work of people within the craft or industry.

What we call an invention is the dramatic moment that people single out from the long slow process in order to have a convenient symbol. This is a purely formal concept that falsifies more than it reveals. Mr. Gilfillan correctly points out that no one invention, or line of inventions, revolutionizes a civilization; he independently corroborates the observation, which I set forth in "Technics and Civilization," that we should have had a power age without Watt and the steam engine, that we should have had multitudinous lines of transportation with worldwide commerce—as indeed we *did* have before 1850—even if the steam vessel had not partly supplanted the sailing ship. Incidentally the author, while sufficiently respectful to Professor Ogburn, effectually demolishes his shallow notion of a cultural lag, which assumed that the physical sciences and mechanical invention form an isolated complex, by means of which the rate and quality of change in other parts of society could be measured and appraised.

All in all, "The Sociology of Invention" is a highly useful book. It answers important questions and poses many more. If its literary form were only a little more attractive, it might serve to destroy a good many popular misconceptions about mechanical invention—fetishes to which

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Fuss Over Mexico

Blood-Drenched Altars, by Francis Clement Kelley. Milwaukee: The Bruce Publishing Company. 502 pages. $3.

Chaos in Mexico, by Charles S. MacFarland. New York: Harper and Brothers. 284 pages. $2.

Three Dollars a Year, by G. Russell Steininger and Paul Van de Velde. New York: The Diamond Press. 117 pages. $2.50.

Tempest Over Mexico, by Rosa E. King. Boston: Little, Brown and Company. 319 pages. $3.

THE RELIGIOUS conflict in Mexico, though related to the general world crisis of Christianity, is none the less intimately connected with the special problems—social, political and economic—that American imperialism imposes on the country. The authors of "Blood-Drenched Altars" and "Chaos in Mexico" both unconsciously reveal that fact. The role of American diplomacy in undermining the power and influence of the Catholic Church, the part that Protestantism plays as an ally of Yankee capitalist penetration, the possibility that clerical and anti-clerical disorders are revolutionary symptoms and hence a menace to both native and foreign exploiters, are questions that disturb even these men of the cloth, although they are unable or unwilling to grapple with them.

Bishop Kelley's book is a weak defense of the Mexican Catholic Church. Badly written and historically unsound, it reeks with a narrowness reminiscent of the worst abuses of the Mexican hierarchy in the heyday of its power. The Reverend Charles S. MacFarland, in contrast, has plainly made an honest and sincere effort to understand the "Chaos in Mexico." As a liberal Protestant minister, he is anxious to be fair toward both the Catholic Church and the state. Thus he interviews scores of Mexicans and others living in the country, quotes the opinions of many more, cites newspaper reports, official statements of various sorts and finally comes to his conclusions.

Mr. MacFarland very candidly warns the reader that if, after reading his book, he finds himself in "seemingly inextricable confusion, it may perhaps offer the best proof that I have presented an accurate story." The confusion, unfortunately, is there and is quite inextricable, suggesting that the kind of accuracy his story represents is worthless for all practical purposes. Mr. MacFarland understands too little of Mexico's political and economic history to sift, evaluate and give meaning to his mass of contradictory material.

A book that clergymen, liberals and all others seriously concerned with Mexico could read with great profit is "Three Dollars a Year." It is a detailed study, pleasantly arranged, of a tiny village of Zapotec Indians perched high in the mountains of Oaxaca. Three dollars is the annual budget of the average inhabitant, but this gives no idea of the extreme poverty that condemns these Indians to live at a cultural level scarcely better than neolithic. Here one is brought face to face with some of the basic problems of contemporary Mexico, problems that neither the Church nor the present government is willing or able to solve. The book has one serious defect: facts and figures, selected with sufficient realism, are often interpreted with a painful lack of that same realism.

Mrs. King has given us a competent story of her experiences in the Revolution of 1910. An English widow [illegible] opened first a tearoom and then a hotel in [illegible] nessed is purely personal. Hence the intensity of her reactions and the scope of her observations are limited by her emotional and intellectual faculties. Nevertheless, an intuitive and wholly admirable spirit of sympathy and generosity toward the underdog leads her to see and understand certain of the fundamental realities of the revolutionary upheaval. Thus she comes to realize the justice of Zapata's cause and to understand that she and her aristocratic friends were "individually . . . good, brave, suffering, loving justice and freedom in our muddling way. But together . . . cogs in a system that had enslaved free men."

On the whole, "Tempest Over Mexico" is the most satisfying of the four books under review, not only because it is the best written and deals with moving, spectacular events, but because the picture it gives of Mexico is the most consistently true and significant. The tempest she describes takes on meaning; it is the key to the Mexican chaos.

CLYDE O. HUNTER.

The Poet's Fancy

On Imagination: Coleridge's Critical Theory, by I. A. Richards. New York: Harcourt, Brace and Company. 252 pages. $2.75.

IT IS easy to see why Richards has been attracted to Coleridge. Coleridge, for Richards, "was a semasiologist—aware, as few have been, that to ask about the meanings of words is to ask about everything." The appeal of such a person to the co-author of "The Meaning of Meaning" should be obvious. As a rehabilitation of Coleridge's critical theory, the present work is important, but it is still more important as a further exposition of Richards' own position as set forth in his earlier works, this time in a form more concrete and more comprehensible perhaps because related to Coleridge's pronouncements.

The study turns upon Coleridge's definition of the imagination, two aspects of which seem to me in Richards' treatment to be most important. First, Richards defends the validity of Coleridge's famous distinction between the fancy and the imagination, a distinction later critics have tended to discount. His comments on the difference between the imaginative and the fanciful figure are brilliant. It is a characteristic of his particular talent and method to light up such blind alleys of criticism as, for instance, the statement "fused in the imagination"—a point where most criticism must stop—by going on to show what fusion in the imagination means. Here his interest in psychology serves him well.

But I am not sure that he altogether acquits Coleridge. In particular one could wish that he had dealt more fully with the sort of imagery used by Donne and some of our moderns, imagery that Coleridge was committed to call a product of the fancy. There are brilliant hints: "Donne most often builds in the mode of the fancy, with imaginative units formed in 'meanings's press and screw' "; or, "With fancy, we . . . let an awareness of . . . [the] irrelevance in to gain a mixed effect, of burlesque for instance." Many of our moderns use the "irrelevance" for ironical effect.

In the second place, Richards relates Coleridge's conception of the imagination to his view, often expressed in earlier books, that "poetry can save us." Coleridge is right, Richards says, in seeing that it is the synthesizing power of the primary imagination that *makes* our world for us, giving us "the usual world of the senses." It is this [illegible] secondary aspect that the poet uses when

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

"the rest of the fabric of the world of values." Poetry can save us, therefore, by serving to give integration and meaning to a world that has been split up and dissected by the analytic power of science.

Poetry is not less serious than science or less important; nor is it to be disparaged because it employs myths, for science employs myths too, only myths with another purpose and another relevance. "If we grant that all is myth, poetry, as the myth-making which most brings 'the whole soul of man into activity' . . . becomes the necessary channel for the reconstitution of order." But if Richards substitutes poetry for religion as Eliot has charged, it should be noticed that he frees it from science and morals, and the last matter is one that Marxian critics should ponder. Richards' chapter, "The Boundaries of the Mythical," needs to be compared very closely with John Crowe Ransom's "God Without Thunder," and with Eliot's position, for an appreciation not only of Richards, but of Ransom and Eliot. The fundamental problems of poetry and especially modern poetry head up here. Richards is one of the few critics whom the serious student of poetry *must* read.

CLEANTH BROOKS, JR.

Novels in Brief

They Shall Inherit the Earth, by Morley Callaghan. New York: Random House. $2.50.

TO READ Callaghan one would suppose that the world was made up of people who wore their emotions on their sleeves and their souls tucked loosely into their cuffs. His characters are passionately concerned with themselves and with whomever happens to be in the same room. Tangible and pressing problems like unemployment and starvation do not make any impression on them, though several of them are poor and have no jobs. You are asked to listen to the bellowing of their egoes, the head-on crashes of their wills. Sometimes when there does exist some peace and quiet among them, you are given to understand that it is only because a Love, so potent as to annihilate everything but the people concerned, has magically manifested itself. Yet so intimate is the author's style, so full of earnestness and honesty, that you fall into the mood of his brooding and, while reading the novel, are likely to accept such figures as Michael Aikenhead and his father as actual people. The story Mr. Callaghan tells of them is not so convincing, partly because it is obscured by the prominence of their emotions (the author has a habit of introducing Love whenever his characters are in a tight situation), and partly because it is maneuvered to point a moral. But all the book really needs is for its author to get his feet on the ground, firmly. Even with its weaknesses, it is warm and eloquent, a novel that is easy to read. J. M.

At Madame Bonnard's, by Joseph Vogel. New York: Alfred A. Knopf. $2.

The simplest thing and the best thing to be said about this first novel is that it does not fall into the dull arrangements of rooming-house novels. Although the characters are more fragments, pieces of accurately observed behavior, than human beings, they are not the usual types. Senseless insecurity, smugness, loneliness, not plotty tricks, form the casual relationships among them. Sentences are set down in good order, events don't clip neatly together to shape a minor "Grand Hotel," scraps of conversation, bickerings, quarrels ring true. All th[illegible] Wedding" a memorable story has been left out. When the rooming house has been torn down, the book ends, the characters scatter. A good deal has happened; but not to the reader. K. W.

The "Johanna Maria," by Arthur Van Schendel. Translated by Brian W. Downs. New York: Longmans, Green and Company. $2.

"The 'Johanna Maria'" has the epic plainness that Sir Arthur Quiller-Couch claims for it in his introduction. But it raises, I think, the dreadful question of relevance. It is a novel of "the pursuit by a lover of his beloved," and Jacob Brouwer's beloved is a ship in which he went sailmaker for years under the Dutch flag, followed her under other flags and lost her, and found her again when they were both old. Brouwer seems to adore his ship for her feminine beauty, but you would think that in forty years he could have seen more than that. If he thought so long of her beauty, he must also have thought about her goodness, that she was a good working part, like himself, of the world they both lived in, and she was most beautiful because she was so good. But the story lacks this connection with the world and, for the confusion of those who believe man journeys alone, Brouwer loses his humanity in his isolation, as the ship loses her worth. L. C.

White Ladies, by Francis Brett Young. New York: Harper and Brothers. $2.50.

"White Ladies" tastes like old potatoes. God knows you can't have new potatoes all the year round, but the fact remains that old potatoes are mealy in the mouth. It isn't a bad book, of course. As Time's editor would remark, all credit to Author Young for an ably documented tale of the

CHINA'S MILLIONS

ANNA LOUISE STRONG

The author of the recent best seller, "*I Change Worlds*," has written the most brilliant, vivid and penetrating analysis of the forces that underlie the strange winds of revolution and civil war that are blowing strongly over the Far East today.

"A remarkable series of extraordinarily brilliant thumb-nail sketches." —*New Masses*

"Journalism of the highest order—vivid, colorful, exciting." —*The New York Post*

"An unforgettable picture." —*Charles A. Beard*

"Like John Reed's *Ten Days That Shook the World*, China's Millions is journalistic history." —*New Republic*

457 Pages KNIGHT PUBLICATIONS, Inc., New York $2.50

THEATERS

THE THEATRE GUILD *Presents*
(In association with JOHN C. WILSON)
The Taming of the Shrew
with ALFRED LUNT & LYNN FONTANNE
GUILD THEATRE, 52nd Street, West of Broadway
Evgs. 8:40. Matinees Thursday & Saturday, 2:40

THE THEATRE GUILD *Presents*
GEORGE GERSHWIN'S
PORGY and BESS
Book by Du Bose Heyward
Lyrics by Du Bose Heyward and Ira Gershwin
Directed by ROUBEN MAMOULIAN

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

iron age in England's Black Country. Mr. Young writes readably enough not to be arrested, he has sometimes a fresh eye for detail and he has obviously been most conscientious about getting up his material; but the gist of the matter is not in him. Men and women are the colors of the novelist's palette, and in this picture the colors are both muddy and thin; the drawing is second-hand, derivative, old stuff. In short, I accuse Mr. Young of a crime that is currently considered only a misdemeanor, and for which he will never be arraigned before posterity: no genius.

T. S. M.

Everything Is Thunder, by J. L. Hardy. New York: Doubleday, Doran and Company. $2.

This is another war story and more glamorous than most, though it is always cheerful to notice how very tender the tender emotions can be against a background of violence. A British officer escapes from a German prison. It is what you might call a sensitive escape. The man would like to convince himself that he is as brave as he is thought to be, he is racked by the dishonor of having to kill a guard. In Berlin he is sheltered by a prostitute, they fall in love and she dies for him, not in his arms. The book has to recommend it almost no attempt at style and, though this is counteracted by the philosophy implicit in it, no effort to romanticize motives or situations. But the title is unfortunate. There is not much thunder here, only a gentle booming from off stage that brings suspense and rarity to the feelings of two characters who are simply and, in the case of the girl, almost beautifully, portrayed. E. C.

Contributors

HARRY THORNTON MOORE, a recent graduate of the University of Chicago, has written for the leading British magazines. He has just completed a novel that has been accepted for publication in England.

LINDSAY ROGERS, in addition to being Burgess Professor of Public Law at Columbia University, has written numerous books and magazine articles, chiefly in the fields of economics and political science.

VIRGINIA HAMILTON lives in Montclair, New Jersey. She has had poems accepted by The Atlantic Monthly and Poetry.

HANS KOHN is professor of history at Smith College, and is the author of "A History of Nationalism in the East" and "Orient and Occident."

JOHN BAKELESS has both taught and practised journalism in New York City. He has written, among other books, "The Economic Causes of Modern War."

NORBERT GUTERMAN, born in Poland and educated at the University of Paris, has spent the last two years studying and writing in this country.

HAMILTON BASSO is digging in for the winter on his farm in the mountains of North Carolina. He is working on a new novel, which he hopes to finish by spring.

B. H. HAGGIN, music critic of The Brooklyn Daily Eagle, is completing "The Oxford Book of the Symphony."

LEWIS MUMFORD last year published "Technics and Civilization" and is now working on a companion volume in which he will carry forward the interpretation of modern life in terms of the arts and sciences.

CLEANTH BROOKS, JR. is a member of the English department at Louisiana State University and is one of the managing editors of The Southern Review.

The initials signed to the brief reviews are those of Jerre Mangione, Kenneth White, Lloyd Collins, T. S. Matthews and Eleanor Clark.

The Epic Plan Discussed in an Exciting Debate
Upton SINCLAIR vs. Norman THOMAS
Roger Baldwin, *Chairman*
MECCA TEMPLE, Sunday, Nov. 17th, at 8 P. M.
Tickets: 55c, 83c, $1.10, $1.65. From: Socialist Call, Workers' Bookshop, Rand School, Columbia Univ. Bookstore and New York Forum.
Auspices: New York Forum, 39 East 10th Street, New York City
Subject: Production for Use—Can It Be Established under Capitalism?

Winter Garden B'way & 50th Evenings 8:30 | Mats. Thurs. & Sat., $1—$2.50 Eves. Orch, $3—$4. Balc. $1 up | Plus Tax
"The whole thing stirs with the life of superior stage entertainment." —*Atkinson, Times.*
BEATRICE LILLIE AND ETHEL WATERS
IN
AT HOME ABROAD
HERB WILLIAMS and ELEANOR POWELL
A Musical Holiday by DIETZ and SCHWARTZ. A Vincente Minnelli Production

TSA (Terminable Securities Act). This Recovery Plan has been sent to a number of people of all shades of opinion. But very few comments have been received. One of the best, from a woman, is as follows: "Thank you for your plan. It is absolutely sound and workable but there are none so blind as those who do not want to see. Every individual who has 'coupons' simply boils when asked to consider it. No wonder the world must go on suffering." For a short description of this Plan see the October 30th issue, page 344.

SCHOOL

Hill and Hollow Farm
HYDE PARK, N. Y.
Send your child to the country—while you travel, get well, or finish the job that needs quiet concentration. A modern home and country advantages plus complete nursery school supervision for children, 2 to 6. Children accepted for short periods. Reasonable rates. Highly recommended. Mr. and Mrs. Paul Garrigue, Hyde Park, New York (in Dutchess County, 2 hrs. from New York City). Tel.: Hyde Park, 61 F 31.

LANGUAGES

$2.50 Monthly, 8 Classes: French, Spanish, Italian, Russian, German. $1 private (full hour) Native instructors.

A Delightful Hide-Away
in the mountains inviting people of better taste. Excellent table, solariums, seasonable sports. Library, musicals, open fireplaces.
Chesters' Zunbarg
Woodbourne, N. Y. Tel: Fallsburg 2F 22

SOCIAL INSURANCE

MEN, WOMEN AND THEIR CHILDREN interested in insuring against the costs of hospital care in the event of illness or injury, write for details to Dept. 166, The First Mutual Health Insurance Company of Wilmington, Delaware.
Benefits include semi-private accommodations, X-ray, use of the operating room, anaesthetic and laboratory examinations.

WORKERS' COLLEGE

COLLEGE FOR WORKERS in Ozarks. Total cost $50 for 3 months, start Dec. 30. Commonwealth College, Mena, Ark.

Order your books—all books—mailed anywhere in the U. S. A.
POSTAGE FREE
from NEW REPUBLIC BOOKS
40 East 49th St., New York, N. Y.

PAUL LUTTINGER, M. D.
and
DANIEL LUTTINGER, M.D.
5 Washington Square North
Office hours: 1—2, 6—8
Except Sundays and Holidays
Telephones:
GRamercy 7-2090 — GRamercy 7-2091

CORRESPONDENCE CLUB

LONG EVENINGS OF LEISURE are pleasantly and inexpensively enjoyed by writing to intelligent people. Unusual books loaned free. Send 3c stamp to CONTACTS, Box 91, Station D, New York City.

THE SPECIAL CLASSIFIED RATE OF THE NEW REPUBLIC IS:
One Inch—1 insertion $4.00
One Inch—3 insertions $3.50
One Inch—6 insertions $3.00
Larger space proportionately more.
THE NEW REPUBLIC
40 East 49th Street, New York, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED